Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe

The Fascist Kernel of Ukrainian Genocidal Nationalism

Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe

The Fascist Kernel of Ukrainian Genocidal Nationalism

Grzgorz Rossoliński-Liebe is a postdoctoral fellow at the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institute of the Free University Berlin. He is the author of "Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist: Fascism, Genocide, and Cult," the first comprehensive biography of the Ukrainian far-right leader and the first in-depth study of his political cult. Rossoliński-Liebe has published several articles about the Holocaust, antisemitism, fascism, World War II, nationalism, Soviet history, mass violence, and the politics of memory in East-Central Europe.

Image from cover:

Stanisławów: Parade of Ukrainian youth in folk costumes in honor of Hans Frank, October 1941. Image courtesy of Narodowego Archiwum Cyfrowego syg. 2-3022.

Abstract

This study briefly presents the history of the radical form of Ukrainian nationalism, paying special attention to the geopolitical circumstances which formed this movement. Then, it analyzes some aspects of this phenomenon, such as its main ideologists, racism, antisemitism, religion, rituals, leaders, concepts of revolution, and the ethnic, political and mass violence conducted before, during, and after the Second World War. This short monograph argues that the extreme and genocidal form of Ukrainian nationalism did have a fascist kernel and should be considered a form of European or East-Central European fascism. Nevertheless, because of the specific cultural, social, and political Ukrainian circumstances the radical form of Ukrainian nationalism differed from better-known fascist movements such as German National Socialism or Italian Fascism, and thus it requires a careful and nuanced investigation.

The Fascist Kernel of Ukrainian Genocidal Nationalism

The First World War reinforced the crisis of traditional values and made mass violence a common European experience. It rearranged the political order in Europe, dissolving empires and leading to the foundation of new states, many of which were not prepared to be ruled democratically. It also left states such as Germany and Hungary with the feeling of having lost parts of their national territories, and several national communities such as the Slovaks, Croats, and Ukrainians without a state. These cultural, social, and political changes led to the emergence of a new authoritarian, ultranationalist, and militaristic movement with socialist roots, which was called fascism after its first promoters, the Italian Fascists. From the very beginning, fascism was a transnational movement. It adapted to the particular cultural, social, and political situations in national states and stateless national communities and also impacted several non-European countries. While in states with democratic and liberal traditions such as Great Britain, fascists became a rather outlandish but tolerated political group, in other states such as Italy and Germany, they took power and established regimes. In addition, many authoritarian regimes such as António de Oliveira Salazar's in Portugal, Ioannis Metaxas's in Greece, and Francisco Franco's in Spain adopted various fascist elements without becoming typical fascist dictatorships.

This study analyzes how fascism affected the stateless community of Ukrainians in eastern Galicia and Volhynia, which between 1918 and 1939 were parts of the Second Polish Republic. In analyzing the radical form of Ukrainian nationalism, this short monograph concentrates on the Ukrainian Military Organization (*Ukraïns'ka Viis'kova Orhanizatsiia*, UVO), the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (*Orhanizatsia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv*, OUN), and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (*Ukraïns'ka Povstans'ka Armiia*, UPA), but it does not claim that other parts of the Ukrainian society were not affected by fascism. Nevertheless, because Soviet policies prevented dissemination of fascism in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the majority of all Ukrainians were not exposed to fascist ideology, and knew fascism only as a demonized and distorted notion from Soviet propaganda. On the other hand, Ukrainians in Romania and Czechoslovakia, as well as the diaspora communities in countries such as Germany, Canada, and the United States of America, were important outposts of the Ukrainian revolutionary nationalism rooted in southeastern Poland.

In addition to exploring the impact of fascism on Ukrainian radical and revolutionary nationalism, this study explains the role played by mass violence in the ideology of Ukrainian nationalists, and discusses the ethnic and political violence they committed during and after the Second World War. The article also considers whether— or in what sense— the radical and fascistic form of Ukrainian nationalism became genocidal, and whether the Ukrainian nationalists committed genocides or were involved in them.

An analysis of Ukrainian nationalism in the context of fascist studies is not a simple undertaking. The Ukrainian nationalists were ambivalent about their relationship to fascism, which they generally endorsed and admired but did not always want to be associated with. Because of this ambiguity, the OUN is described in this study, depending on the context, as a "Ukrainian radical nationalist," "Ukrainian nationalist," or "fascist" movement. This might appear confusing or even contradictory, but it is necessary in order to demonstrate the complexity of the meaning of "fascism" in the ideology of the Ukrainian nationalists, who called themselves "nationalists" but emphasized that they belonged to the family of European fascist movements and were closely related to the Italian Fascists, German National Socialists, British Fascists, Croatian Ustaša, and other similar movements.

By examining Ukrainian radical nationalism in the context of fascist studies, this study does not argue that Ukrainian writers, historians, scientists, or politicians such as Taras Shevchenko, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi, and Stepan Rudnyts'kyi were fascists. Yet some of their writings are analyzed in this short monograph, either to discuss how the ideologists of Ukrainian nationalism used their ideas for their own needs or to show how these writings contributed to the invention of Ukrainian discourses about ethnicity, eugenics, and racism, which became an integral element of the ideology of the OUN and UPA.

Radical post-1918 Ukrainian nationalism developed from the more moderate pre-1918 Ukrainian nationalism, which was influenced by socialist ideas and was— with the exception of a few writers such as Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi—not explicitly hostile to ethnic minorities such as Jews and Poles. Only the experience of the First World War, the failure to establish a state, and the reception of racist, fascist, and antisemitic discourses transformed this nationalism into a rather typical East Central European fascist movement. Pre-1918 Ukrainian nationalism, on the other hand, was obviously not fascist and did not regard mass violence as a means to achieve its political goals.

The radical form of Ukrainian nationalism has not been investigated in the context of fascist studies until recently. During the Cold War, this radical and

revolutionary Ukrainian nationalism was presented by veterans of the movement, and among them historians at Western universities, as an anti-Soviet and anti-German "liberation movement." Relying on accounts of these veterans and applying the theoretical notions of integral nationalism, historians such as John Armstrong defined Ukrainian nationalism as a form of "integral nationalism." Political scientists such as Alexander Motyl argued that although the OUN had been strongly influenced by fascism, they could not have been fascist because they had no Ukrainian state in which to practice fascism in the manner of the Italian Fascists, the German National Socialists, or the Croatian Ustaša. Historians in post-communist Ukraine compared the OUN and its 1943-founded UPA to the nineteenth–century Polish insurgents or the Irish Republican Army, and argued that they resembled romantic and anti-imperialistic freedom fighters more than fascists.[1] This narrative was challenged only recently by scholars who contextualized Ukrainian radical and genocidal nationalism and viewed it from the theoretical perspective of fascist studies. By doing so, they illuminated the interrelation between the radical form of Ukrainian nationalism and transnational fascism.[2]

Fascism: Ideal Type and East Central European Specifics

"Fascism" is one of the most intriguing but also most contested phenomena of twentieth-century history. To avoid misunderstandings, it should be clarified how the term will be used to explore the subject of this study.

The first interpretations of fascism occurred in the 1920s and 1930s and were frequently authored by Marxist scholars and communists. Many of these interpretations lacked complexity and were more political doctrines than academic theories. A number of communist and Soviet thinkers applied the term "fascism" in the same way to the Italian Fascists as they did to various conservative, authoritarian, or military regimes such as the Józef Piłsudski regime in Poland, the Antanas Smetona regime in Lithuania, or the Miklós Horthy authoritarian government in Hungary.[3] In Soviet discourse, all opponents of the Soviet Union including democratic countries such as the United States, France, West Germany, and the United Kingdom were called fascist.[4] The first theoretical and nuanced scholarly interpretations of fascism were written in the 1960s by authors such as Ernst Nolte, Eugen Weber, and George L. Mosse. Some of these scholars began to empirically investigate various forms of European fascism and developed theoretical models of generic fascism that were

used by scholars such as Stanley Payne, Zeev Sternhell, and Renzo de Felice. Ernst Nolte, on the other hand, presented his own approach to fascism.[5]

The early scholars of fascism concentrated on Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Action Française, the Croatian Ustaša, and some other better-known movements while paying almost no attention to Ukrainian nationalism. As a consequence, the radical form of Ukrainian nationalism was investigated only by the anticommunist historian John Armstrong; historians of the Ukrainian diaspora, including veterans of the OUN, UPA, and Waffen-SS Galizien; and occasionally some German specialists on Nazi Germany or East European history, who generally followed Armstrong and were suspicious about transnational fascist studies, which, in their view, undermined the history of Nazi Germany and questioned German responsibility for the Holocaust.[6]

The present theoretical understanding of fascism was to a great extent shaped in the 1990s by scholars such as Roger Griffin, Robert Paxton, Roger Eatwell, and Emilio Gentile.[7] These scholars based their writings on the earlier theoretical models and encouraged other scholars to explore further aspects of this intriguing phenomenon. Recent studies combined those theoretical frameworks with empirical approaches to particular aspects and movements, exploring features such as fascist aesthetic and cultural representations,[8] genocide and violence,[9] fascist internationalism,[10] fascism and religion,[11] and racism and eugenics.[12] These authors considerably extended scholarly understanding of fascism and uncovered aspects and links that had not been known earlier.

To analyze Ukrainian nationalism in the context of fascist studies, a particular definition of fascism is needed. This definition will start from the concept of generic fascism coined by Roger Griffin, who focused on ideology and adopted a Weberian ideal-type methodology. In his concept of generic fascism, Griffin emphasized the myth, its mobilizing force, and its revolutionary, populist, and ultranationalist framework: "Fascism is a genus of political ideology whose mythic core in its various permutations is a palingenetic form of populist ultranationalism."[13] To be more specific, this concept should be extended by several negations to regard as fascist only those movements that were entirely or in great part antidemocratic, anti-Marxist, antiliberal, anticonservative, authoritarian, ultranationalist, populist, racist, antisemitic, militarist, and which adopted the Führerprinzip, practiced the cult of ethnic and political violence, and regarded mass violence as an extension of politics.[14] Finally, it should be emphasized that fascist movements in East Central Europe such as the Hlinka Party, Ustaša, and Iron Guard developed forms of fascism differing from the fascism of regimes that controlled industrial, urban, and powerful states such as Italy or Germany. Fascism in East Central European states

and stateless ethnic communities came into being in different cultural, political, and social circumstances and was created by men and women with different cultural backgrounds and political expectations than those in states such as Germany or Italy. The Iron Guard's ideology was manufactured around religion and mysticism. The Slovak Hlinka Party and Croatian Ustaša regarded themselves as "liberation movements" and "freedom fighters" who struggled for the independence of their states. Such notions and ideals did not play any significant role among the German National Socialists and Italian Fascists.[15]

History and Geopolitical Circumstances

The nature of Ukrainian radical nationalism was determined by both European fascist discourses and the complicated history of Ukrainians, for whom the OUN wanted to establish a state of a fascist type. In the nineteenth century, "Ukrainians," or people who began to perceive themselves as Ukrainians as a result of the invention of Ukrainian identity, lived in two empires. About 80 percent of them were subjects of the Russian Empire, and about 20 percent resided in eastern Galicia and Bukovina, which belonged to the Habsburg Empire. The policy of Russification in Russian Ukraine, especially in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, prevented the expansion of Ukrainian nationalism in this territory. Many eastern Ukrainians understood Ukraine to be a region of Russia and themselves as a people akin to Russians. Hostility to Russia did not make sense to them, but it made much more sense to the small group of "nationally educated" Ukrainians, many of whom lived in eastern Galicia where they enjoyed the liberal policies of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and competed (not very successfully) with the Polish rulers of this province.[16]

Although Ukrainians during and after the First World War proclaimed a Ukrainian state in Kiev as the center of Ukraine, and another state in Lviv as the center of western Ukraine, they did not succeed in keeping either of them. These states were also not recognized by the Treaty of Versailles or by neighbouring countries, particularly the Second Polish Republic and the Soviet Union, which claimed the same territories.[17] As a result of the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye, the Treaty of Versailles, the Treaty of Riga, and other treaties signed after the First World War, about 26 million Ukrainians lived in Soviet Ukraine, about 5 million in Poland, 0.5 million in the Czechoslovak Republic, and 0.8 million in Greater Romania.[18] In the

interwar period Ukrainian revolutionary and extremist nationalism did not develop in the Soviet Union, which remained unaffected by fascism, but thrived in the territory of the Second Republic, which included eastern Galicia from the Habsburg Empire and the western part of Volhynia from the Russian Empire. Of these two regions, eastern Galicia was the heart of revolutionary ultranationalist activism.[19]

In 1920 a group of Ukrainian veterans of the First World War, disappointed by the geopolitical status quo, founded the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO) in Prague. Some of the best known activists of this organization were Ievhen Konovalets', Andrii Mel'nyk, Mykola Stsibors'kyi, Roman Sushko, and Richard Iaryi. Before founding the UVO, they fought against the Poles, Bolsheviks, and Whites in various Ukrainian armies such as the Sich Riflemen, a unit of the Ukrainian People's Army (*Armia Ukraïns'koï Narodnoï Respubliky*, AUNR), which had been established from the soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian army, or the Ukrainian Galician Army (*Ukraïns'ka Halyts'ka Armiia*, UHA). The UVO, however, did not become a mass political movement, but rather a terrorist organization that financed itself by spying for the German *Abwehr* and intelligence services of other countries such as Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia.[20]

The situation changed only in the late 1920s. At the First Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists, which took place from 28 January to 3 February 1929 in Vienna, the leadership of the UVO in cooperation with other nationalist politicians founded the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (*Orhanizatsia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv*, OUN). In the course of amalgamation, the League of Ukrainian Fascists (*Soiuz ukraïns'kykh fashystiv*, SUF), inventor of the Ukrainian fascist salute "Glory to Ukraine!" (*Slava Ukraïni!*), also entered the OUN, which adopted the salute and other fascist rituals. In addition, more and more young Ukrainians who were born around 1910 joined the movement. Some of their leading representatives were Stepan Bandera, Iaroslav Stets'ko, Stepan Lenkavs'kyi, and Roman Shukhevych. This younger generation, including many students, soon began controlling the homeland executive of the OUN. This political body determined policies in eastern Galicia and Volhynia but was subordinated to the leadership in exile, which was composed of veterans of the First World War and founders of the UVO who were born around 1890. The young generation was in many respects more radical than the older one. Although both generations had similar positive attitudes to fascism, racism, and antisemitism, the younger generation was more eager to use terror and violence. Different realms of experience and expectations caused a conflict between the younger and older generations and contributed to the 1940 split of the OUN into the OUN-B (led by Stepan Bandera) and the OUN-M (led by Andrii Mel'nyk).[21]

During the interwar period, the center of activism of the Ukrainian nationalists was the Second Polish Republic. The cultural, social, and political situation in Poland, particularly discrimination against national minorities, pushed many Ukrainians into the OUN and significantly strengthened this movement. The Polish authorities tried to win the loyalty of Ukrainians through repression of their national aspirations and teaching them Polish patriotism. They dissolved many Ukrainian schools and transformed some into bilingual Polish-Ukrainian schools (*szkoły utrakwistyczne*). The Ukrainian language was abandoned at universities and regarded by Polish officials as a substandard variety of Polish, while Ukrainian culture was perceived by Polish nationalists as inferior to Polish culture. Ukrainians could not find jobs in public service, possessed less land than Poles, and generally had good reasons to resent the Polish state and its policies that treated the Ukrainian minority as second-class citizens.[22]

The main task of the UVO and OUN was to liberate the "Ukrainian territories" and to establish a Ukrainian state. The first commandment of "The Decalogue of a Ukrainian Nationalist," drafted in 1929 by the OUN member Stepan Lenkavs'kyi, said: "Attain a Ukrainian state or die in the struggle for it."[23] To change the geopolitical situation and establish such a state, Ukrainians looked for partners and waited for war or conflict between the "occupiers" of Ukraine. The UVO and OUN regarded Germany as their most important ally, because no other European state was as interested in changing the status quo of the geopolitical order as Germany. Alliance with Germany and other fascist movements allowed the OUN to appear as a serious political movement that could "liberate" Ukraine. Especially in the last years before the Second World War, the OUN won more and more supporters among young Ukrainians in Poland.[24]

Because of the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, almost all Ukrainian territories were incorporated into Soviet Ukraine after the start of the Second World War. At that moment, many Ukrainian nationalists left Ukraine and went to the General Government, where they collaborated with the Nazis and particularly the Abwehr. The younger faction of the OUN, the OUN-B, worked on the "Ukrainian National Revolution," which they intended to begin at the same time as Operation Barbarossa. The leaders of this faction decided to proclaim a Ukrainian state after the German attack on the Soviet Union, and hoped that the Nazis would accept it, as they had accepted Slovakia in March 1939 and Croatia in April 1941. The Nazi leaders, however, did not plan to establish a Ukrainian or any other collaborationist state in the territories that were released from Soviet occupation after 22 June 1941.[25] Whether they were uninformed about this circumstance or simply taking chances,

the OUN-B proclaimed Ukrainian statehood on 30 June in Lviv, as the Lithuanian Activist Front (*Lietuvos aktyvistų frontas*, LAF) had done on 23 June 1941 in Kovno, where it announced the existence of a Lithuanian state.[26] The Ukrainian act of state proclamation—which Iaroslav Stets'ko, the representative of the *Providnyk* Stepan Bandera, read at about 8 p.m. in the *Prosvita* hall in Lviv Market Square—resembled the text that had been used on 10 April 1941 by Slavko Kvaternik, the representative of the *Poglavnik* Ante Pavelić, to announce the Independent Croatian State.[27]

Shortly after the proclamation, Stets'ko sent letters to the Italian *Duce*, the German *Führer*, the Spanish *Caudillo*, and the Croatian *Poglavnik*. He informed them of the existence of the Ukrainian state and expressed a wish for close collaboration and a united fight for a "New Europe."[28] Although the OUN-B supported the Germans during the pogrom in Lviv and its militia assisted the Einsatzkommandos during the first mass shootings, the Germans dissolved Stets'ko's government and took him together with Bandera to Berlin, where they met Kazys Škirpa, the leader of the LAF.[29] The leaders of the OUN-B were confined until autumn 1944 in German prisons and concentration camps. They had the rank of special political prisoners (*Ehrenhäftlinge* or *Sonderhäftlinge*) and enjoyed privileged treatment.[30] A few hundred OUN-B rank and file members were kept in different German camps as political prisoners.[31] They shared to some extent the fate of the Rumanian Iron Guard, who on account of the conflict with Antonescu fled from Romania to Germany in early 1941. When, in late 1942, Horia Sima, the leader of the Iron Guard, went to Italy and tried to convince Mussolini to proceed against Antonescu, the Iron Guard were confined in different German camps. Sima joined Bandera in Zellenbau, a building for Sonderhäftlinge in Sachsenhausen.[32]

In early August 1941, shortly after the imprisonment of the OUN-B leadership, the Germans incorporated eastern Galicia into the General Government as Distrikt Galizien. A large part of other Ukrainian territories became Reichskommissariat Ukraine. In eastern Galicia, the Germans collaborated with less impulsive and more submissive individuals such as Volodomyr Kubiiovych, the head of the Ukrainian Central Committee (*Ukraïns'kyi Tsentral'nyi Komitet*, UTsK). This institution spread German propaganda in eastern Galicia, aryanized Jewish property, and helped the Germans to establish the Waffen-SS Galizien division with more than 8,000 Ukrainian soldiers, who took an oath to Hitler.[33] While Bandera, Stets'ko, and several other OUN-B members remained confined in German concentration camps, the Ukrainian nationalists in Ukraine participated in various ways in the genocide of the Jews and established the UPA, which massacred Poles.[34] After being released from Zellenbau in September 1944, Bandera, together with other Ukrainian

leading politicians such as Mel'nyk, Kubiiovych, and Pavlo Shandruk, agreed to help the Germans to mobilize Ukrainians for the fight against the Soviet Union. The *Providnyk* supported the Germans until early February 1945, when he left Berlin with his family and went to Vienna.[35]

Ideology

Ideology is one of the key areas to which attention must be paid in order to understand how the members of a particular movement perceived themselves, how they imagined shaping the future of their countries, what political aims they wanted to accomplish, and what values they subscribed to. Because the ideology of Ukrainian extreme nationalism, as with every other fascist movement, is a massive and complex subject, this section will introduce only certain crucial aspects of the writings of three main Ukrainian interwar ideologists: Dmytro Dontsov, Ievhen Onats'kyi, and Mykola Stsibors'kyi.

Dmytro Dontsov: Spiritual Leader of The Youth

Dmytro Dontsov (1883–1973) was one of the most significant ideologists of Ukrainian radical and genocidal nationalism. He had enormous influence on the young generation in the OUN, the Ukrainian youth who lived in Poland, and the diaspora in general. Dontsov grew up in the Russian Empire. In his early years, he was fascinated by Marxist and social-democratic thought. In 1922, he resettled in Lviv and around that time became a fervent adherent of fascism. Fascism was for him a fanatical, powerful, and authoritarian movement, which, unlike Bolshevism, was based on radical nationalism and racism. Dontsov called postwar Ukrainian nationalism Ukrainian fascism and regarded it as one of the European fascist movements. He never officially joined the OUN, although the OUN leadership invited him several times to become the head of the OUN propaganda apparatus.[36]

In the article "Are We Fascists?" (*Chy my fashysty?*), published in 1923 in *Zahrava*, Dontsov explained the nature of Italian Fascism and repeated several times, "If this is the program of fascism, then according to me—we are fascists!"[37] Yet as much as Dontsov admired fascism, he did not want to be accused of copying it: "Because we stay on a national platform and the fascists on an international one—we cannot be fascists."[38] Thus, on the one hand, Dontsov claimed that

Ukrainian nationalism was fascist. On the other hand, he emphasized the uniqueness of Ukrainian nationalism and argued that it should not be regarded as part of an international fascism. In the early 1920s, Dontsov also rejected "fascism" as a name for the Ukrainian movement, because the Italians had used it already. Nevertheless, he approved of and was enthusiastic about fascism as a political system and was pleased that Italian Fascism was so similar to Ukrainian nationalism.[39]

In the early 1920s, Dontsov's admiration for fascism was so great that he even claimed to find several fascist motives in the writings of the Ukrainian folkloristic and neoromantic poet and political activist Lesia Ukrainka (1871–1913), who can hardly be classified as a proto-fascist thinker. Yet after local political activists and intellectuals began calling Dontsov and other publicists surrounding the journal *Zahrava* "fascists" and stressing that fascism was not a genuine Ukrainian movement but an Italian and international one, Dontsov avoided the term "fascism," hid his sympathy for it and used instead terms such as "active nationalism" (*chynnyi natsionalizm*) without, however, changing his views and attitude toward fascism. In 1926, Dontsov published his first programmatic book. He called it *Nationalism* and included in it the program of Ukrainian fascism. By choosing the name *nationalism* instead of *fascism*, he avoided the accusation of disseminating an international or non-Ukrainian ideology.[40]

In the 1930s, Dontsov became less concerned about being accused of paying homage to a transnational political system and began promoting fascism and particularly its German variant, which he frequently called Hitlerism.[41] He argued that Nazi Germany was the first regime which would "deal with Bolsheviks in the Bolshevik way"[42] and that "those who are against fascism are working for Bolshevism whether they want to or not."[43]

Although Dontsov simplified and vulgarized the writings of philosophers such as Friedrich Nietzsche, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, his writings were not understandable to everyone. Dontsov's publications were addressed primarily to youth from high schools and universities or people who possessed some basic knowledge about history and philosophy. Dontsov had particular influence on the younger generation of the OUN that was born around 1910. He believed that he could create from these people a "new type of man" who would fight for Ukraine more fanatically and effectively than those who had failed to establish a Ukrainian state during and after the First World War. In order to create this "new type of man," he encouraged the younger generation to break with Ukrainian traditions that he regarded as a cultural and political burden.[44] Young Ukrainian nationalists read Dontsov and were inspired by him. For example, in 1935 a group of young

Ukrainians in Przemyśl (Peremyshl'), who set up a Society of Fascist Studies (*Tovarystvo fashyzmoznavstva*), asked Dontsov in a letter to give them leadership and guidance. They wrote that: "Fascism is a universal phenomenon, because it is not a political doctrine but an entire worldview of indestructible principles based on religion and morality."[45]

Dontsov's fascination with fascism and fascist leaders began with his admiration of Italian Fascism and Benito Mussolini, but the ideal of a fascist state and a fascist leader for him were Nazi Germany and Adolf Hitler. Already in 1926, Dontsov translated into Ukrainian and published parts of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. When Mussolini's *The Doctrine of Fascism* (*La Dottrina Del Fascismo*) appeared in 1932, he translated and published it as well. In 1934, the library of the journal *Vistnyk*, which was edited by Dontsov, published a biography of Mussolini by Mykhailo Ostroverkha and a biography of Hitler by Rostyslav Iendyk, both of which began with Dontsov's introductions. Both biographies popularized the idea of a fascist leader in a hagiographic and propagandistic language. Their authors and Dontsov claimed that Mussolini and Hitler were leaders due to their extraordinary features and the will of their nations. They implied that every nation needed a charismatic leader who would lead the people to a better future and help them to overcome all contemporary difficulties. In addition to publishing hagiographies of Mussolini and Hitler, Dontsov also translated and published writings of such Nazi ideologists as Joseph Goebbels and Alfred Rosenberg.[46]

A very fundamental concept of Dontsov's works was "amorality" (*amoral'nist'*). Dontsov declared that *amoral'nist'* is good as long as it helps Ukrainians to obtain a Ukrainian state. This concept reversed the "common" and "universal" system of values and morality. It justified all kinds of crimes and violence as long as they were conducted for the good of the nation, or in order to obtain a state. He argued that only fanaticism and amoral fighting could change history and the unfavorable status quo of not having a state.[47]

Ievhen Onats'kyi: The Rome Representative

Ievhen Onats'kyi, another important Ukrainian radical ideologist, was the OUN representative in Rome.[48] Onats'kyi published articles about fascism in the late 1920s and early 1930s in the official OUN journal *Rozbudova Natsiï*. At the outset, not all OUN members agreed with Onats'kyi's pro-fascist position, and he himself needed some time to realize that one could reconcile Ukrainian nationalism with fascism.

One of his opponents, professor Oleksander Mytsiuk, believed that Ukrainians could not adopt fascism because it was a genuine Italian political system.[49]

In an article from March 1928, Onats'kyi argued that Italian Fascism and Ukrainian nationalism had in common their radical nationalist nature, but they were not the same because Italian Fascism had a state in which it could exist and thrive, while Ukrainian nationalism did not. "Fascism is the nationalism of a nation state," Onats'kyi explained, indicating that Ukrainian nationalism could become fascism only if the Ukrainian nationalists established a state.[50]

Nevertheless, in the course of discussing the subject with Mytsiuk and his own reflections, Onats'kyi changed his understanding of fascism. In the article "We and Fascism" published in December 1929, he ceased emphasizing that fascism was a political system that could exist only in a state and pointed out its uniting and revolutionary features. He implied that fascism, or a group of "heroic fascists," could help a people to overcome a national crisis and make their country great and powerful like Italy:

> Fascism—means first of all *unity*. This is its first and main meaning and it is indicated by the etymology of the word "fascism," which is derived from "fascio"—bundle, bunch.

> At this point in time, when a country descended into chaos, when political and national enmity began reaching its peak, when all acquainted with the Russian and Ukrainian revolution became frightened due to the inevitable catastrophe … at exactly that time a group of people emerged and called for unity in order to rebuild the "Great Italy."[51]

According to Onats'kyi, a fascist revolution, which he understood as the rebuilding of the great past, could also have happened somewhere else, for example in Russia or Ukraine.[52]

Onats'kyi, like Dontsov, claimed that "Italian Fascism and Ukrainian nationalism relied on the youth."[53] Youth was for him the most active, idealistic, and valuable element of society: "And therefore fascism—is pure activity, it is—the youth, armed with faith and idea, sure of themselves and their victory over the low-principled, materialistic, and egoistic enemy."[54]

Using the example of Mussolini, the OUN representative in Rome also emphasized the role of the fascist leader and familiarized Ukrainians with the Führerprinzip:

> Fascism is Mussolini. Nowhere else among the idealistic movement is the

> anthropomorphic necessity as essential as in fascism. Everything of it is almost the result of the personal activity of Benito Mussolini. Only due to him did fascism acquire its particular shape. The fascists of the first times consisted first of all of diverse political remainders, defectors from diverse parties and organizations, and of people who never belonged to a political party. It was necessary to unite and inspire them with one idea and one will.
>
> Mussolini was in the beginning the dictator of a small bunch of his political friends and supporters, then of the party and then of the whole of Italy.[55]

Onats'kyi's description of the leader was abstract enough to explain to Ukrainians that the leader of a fascist movement could exist not only in Italy, but everywhere, and especially in "countries in crisis" needing to go through a revolution:

> The national dictator is truly the representative of energy and the lively vitality of the nation. The crisis helps him to emerge and to present his potentials and his strengths but he makes himself noticeable only because the society and the very nation strive after order and life.
>
> The man of dictatorship, the man of the crisis is first of all determined by character, will, and nothing else than character singles him out from ordinary ambitious men. Like an ambitious man without the necessary intellect, so an intelligent person without a strong character will not elevate to the role of leader [*providnyk*].
>
> He realizes very soon that his own interests and the nation's interests melt together and become one. He cannot compromise them [the nation's interests] in any way. Therefore the nation looks to him with trust and hope. He loves favorites. Further, he loves the brave and it does not matter to him whether somebody breaks the law or not. A dictator becomes a hero, an object of cult and emulation.[56]

Toward the end of his article, Onats'kyi came to the conclusion: "We, the representatives of a hitherto defeated nation, see in fascism, in particular in its first stateless phase—another example to follow—the example of idealism. And we cannot be content with the enforced 'fate' [of not being independent] and need to overcome it. And we will overcome!"[57]

Onats'kyi, like Dontsov, did not insist on using the term "fascism," but argued that "Ukrainian nationalism" was a form of fascism for people without a state. He wrote that Ukrainians would not steal the name of "fascism" from the Italians and that it would be "Ukrainian nationalism" that would unite Ukrainians and fulfill a similar function to that of fascism in Italy.[58] In a brief to Iaroslav Pelenskyi from 20

January 1930, he wrote that "we sympathize with the fascist ideology and share in many points its sociopolitical program," but we should not boast about being fascists because we would thereby "arm everyone and everything against us."[59]

Mykola Stsibors'kyi: The Author of Natsiokratiia

The prominent OUN member Mykola Stsibors'kyi invented in two documents—a treatise from 1935 and a draft of a constitution from 1939—a political system called *natsiokratiia* or the "dictatorship of the nation."[60] Stsibors'kyi's writings were especially interesting because they explained in detail how the OUN would rule its state and also briefly how the OUN would create it. Stsibors'kyi's attitude to fascism was typical of the Ukrainian nationalists. On the one hand, he rejected the idea of sympathizing with fascism, and, on the other, he invented a political system that is best described as a Ukrainian form of fascism. Stsibors'kyi criticized Onats'kyi and other Ukrainian ideologists for using the term "fascism" and being optimistic about this international phenomenon. He argued that the "dictatorship of a nation" was "neither fascist nor national-socialist," but a genuine Ukrainian system. Similarly, he emphasized that the Ukrainian nationalists should never give up the ethnic and national foundations of their ideology and should always present themselves as a movement that was not dependent on or related to other fascist movements.[61] Yet more important than these conceptual and linguistic reservations was the fact that Stsibors'kyi admired fascism as a political system, and invented his own political system which was imbued with fascist values, cultural norms, and aesthetics.

For Stsibors'kyi, fascism was the highest stage of political progress: "Fascism came and tore out from democracy's hands the handicapped ideal of the nation and raised it to an unprecedented level placing in its vital achievements its ardent splendor and pathos of youthful creativity."[62] In addition, he claimed that those nations that turned their backs to fascism and concentrated on their own matters would never have "real peace and freedom."[63] His actual objections to fascism were very limited. The most important one was that the "cult of a certain 'police state'" could stop the development of society and individuality or "impede the process of creative individuality of its citizens."[64]

Thus, it is not surprising that Stsibors'kyi perceived the similarity between the OUN and the Italian and other fascist movements as very disturbing. He argued that only enemies equated Ukrainian nationalism with fascism and pointed out that the Ukrainian nationalists were "*unique* and *independent*."[65] One of the main purposes of inventing natsiokratiia was to have a political system that would be fascist in content

but national on the surface. *Natsiokratiia* was written to improve the image of the OUN and convince Ukrainians that the OUN and Ukrainian extreme nationalism were genuine Ukrainian phenomena that deserved to be supported by every patriotic Ukrainian. Stsibors'kyi argued that the OUN, unlike other Ukrainian parties and movements, did not copy foreign patterns but made its own nationalist politics.[66]

Stsibors'kyi divided his treatise from 1935 into six chapters: democracy, socialism, communism, fascism, dictatorship, and the last and most extensive one on natsiokratiia. He was skeptical about democracy and socialism and presented communism as the worst possible political system of all. He criticized democracy for the "cult of intellect" and communism and socialism for "materialism." In contrast, he highly praised fascism and dictatorship, claiming that fascism focused on the nation:

> Fascism concentrates all its idealism and voluntarism on one center: the very nation. The nation is its greatest value to which everything else is subordinated. Counter to democracy, which has the tendency to regard the nation as a mechanical set of a certain number of individuals, bound together first of all by real interests, *fascism regards the nation as the highest historical, spiritual, traditional and real community, within which occur the processes of existence and creativity of entire generations—the dead, living, and so far unborn—all are inseparably bound together*.[67]

Similarly, discussing corporatism and the economic system in a democratic versus a fascist state, Stsibors'kyi disapproved of democracy and praised fascism:

> Democracy established parliamentarianism because it accepted that a person has its rights and virtues from the moment of birth. Democracy regarded it as its self-purpose. But fascism did not. It regarded the nation-state [*natsiuderzhavu*] as the central point of its ideology and subordinated to it the whole society and individual people. Fascism does not deny virtues to a person although it establishes the attitude of a person to the state not on "inherent human rights" [as democracy does] but *first of all on the obligation toward the nation-state*. Democracy uttered the slogans: "freedom, equality, fraternity." Fascism opposed them with its own slogans: "*obligation, hierarchy, discipline*."[68]

Unlike Onats'kyi, Stsibors'kyi did not hesitate over the question of whether fascism could exist only in states. He claimed that it could also be useful for nations without them:

> *The achievement of fascism-nationalism is that it evokes the primary instinct of the nation, fortifies its ideas and activates its creative potentials not only for its own nation but also others, first of all the oppressed nations*. For the latter the creative spiritual strength of fascism and its struggle for the vital

ideals of a nation should be an unforgettable "memento" and the sign of their own feelings and deeds.[69]

Natsiokratiia was supposed to become the political system of a Ukrainian state, which would be established in the course of a "national revolution." On the one hand, Stsibors'kyi presented natsiokratiia as if it would have grown up from Ukrainian traditions and been deeply rooted in the Ukrainian people.[70] On the other hand, he reminded readers several times that Ukrainian nationalism was one of the "newer nationalistic movements" that belonged to the family of European fascist movements. All of those movements, according to Stsibors'kyi , regarded the nation as the highest value and "equate the state with the nation as an *organic* form of existence." Ukrainian nationalism "understands the nation not as a mechanical set of people bound only by common territory, language and material interests, *but as the highest form of human co-existence*."[71]

Fascism and nationalism were interwoven not only because they placed the nation in the center of their interests, but also because they were both related through fanaticism: "fascism itself is first of all nationalism—the love of one's own motherland and patriotic feeling brought to the level of self-sacrifice and the cult of the sacrificing fanaticism."[72] This system of ideas, however, could not exist without the truth: "The power of nationalism is related to the fanatical belief in its *own truth*."[73] In general, the basic assumptions of natsiokratiia were very modest and even simplistic. Stsibors'kyi explained that "*nationalism builds its ideology on maximalism, healthy egoism, love for its own, intolerance of the alien …*"[74] and emphasized "*Good is everything that is good for the well-being, power and development of my nation; bad is everything, that weakens its power and growth …*"[75]

Although Stsibors'kyi did not point this out, his discussion of fascism and the Ukrainian nation were very much determined by the fact that Ukrainians did not succeed in establishing a state after the First World War, were discriminated against in Poland, and, after a period of relatively liberal national policies in the 1920s, suffered from famine and terror in the Ukrainian SSR. In this sense, Stsibors'kyi's radical speculations were related to the wish for a Ukrainian state that would protect the rights of Ukrainians against their neighbors.[76]

Similarly to other European fascist and ultranationalist ideologists, Stsibors'kyi introduced the category of "race" while discussing the "transformation of races" into "new ethnic collectives."[77] He also borrowed some ideological notions from German imperialist nationalism: "*Ukrainian nationalism understands its own nation as the highest, completely perfect and real value, and worships the slogan: Nation*

above all! The nationalists want to see the Ukrainian Nation *great, mighty, powerful and content.*"[78]

He regarded all parties and organizations that did not agree with the slogan "Ukraine above all" as unacceptable and treacherous. To him, the communists were the agents of the Soviet Union, while the Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (*Ukraïns'ke natsional'no-demokratychne ob"iednannia*, UNDO) were the agents of Poland.[79] He also demanded that all people should not serve parties, but the nation and the state: "State—this *is not only* an organized *community of purpose*; it is first of all, the *holiest* nation that obliges every citizen to *serve, to sacrifice and to high spiritual passion.*"[80]

Stsibors'kyi's most furious hostility was directed against the weak elements of the nation and internal enemies of the state. He argued that "nationalism denies" the "right to exist" to "unsolicited elements" such as "social predators, social idlers, vermin, and political 'chieftains.'"[81] Moreover, he demanded confiscation of the land and property of all non-Ukrainians and forbid them to buy back their land and property.[82] The national masses would both profit from these reforms and become an indispensable part of the new regime: "*We call natsiokratiia the regime of the nation in its own state which is implemented by all socio-beneficial strata, united—according to their socio-productive functions—in the representative organs of the state government.*"[83]

The right moment for implementing natsiokratiia would be after the OUN, in the course of a "national revolution," would take power and establish an "independent, united State." The "national revolution" would be started by the "armed fight against occupiers" and would be "*difficult, bloody and cruel.*" With the help of the masses, the revolutionaries would introduce a "*national dictatorship*" and perform the ultranationalist "rebirth of the society."[84] Stsibors'kyi wrote that opponents would label the new rulers and their "national dictatorship" as fascist and would claim that "'fascists' want to 'enslave' the nation.'" They would do this because they would know that "*national dictatorship is the sign of their infamous death.*"[85]

The ruling organ in the natsiokratiia state would be the *Derzhavna Rada*, a kind of parliament. The representatives elected to this institution would be Ukrainians who belonged to the only legal party, the OUN. Thus the parliament would represent only Ukrainian nationalists of different social classes and occupations.[86] The state would be ruled by the *Vozhd' Natsiï*, the Leader of the Nation, who would be the "greatest of the great sons of the nation who due to the general trust of the nation and to his internal features will hold in his hand the power of the state." All political and

government institutions, such as the *Derzhavna Rada* and the *Derzhavni Sekretari* (council of ministers), would be subordinated to the *Vozhd' Natsiï*.[87]

A draft of a constitution prepared for a Ukrainian state at the request of Mel'nyk in 1939 was much shorter than the treatise from 1935, but did not differ substantially from the earlier document. Stsibors'kyi called the future Ukrainian leader the "Head of the State—The Leader of the Nation [*Holova Derzhavy—Vozhd' Natsiï*]" and, as in 1935, made it clear that all political groups, organizations, or parties with the exception of the OUN would be forbidden.[88]

Leaders

Until 1945 the OUN had three leaders: Ievhen Konovalets', Andrii Mel'nyk, and Stepan Bandera. All of them claimed to be the leaders of all Ukrainian people and sought to become the leaders of a Ukrainian state, which they wanted to establish with the help of the Ukrainian masses. Due to the specific geopolitical circumstances, the Ukrainian leaders acted differently from fascist leaders such as Mussolini, Hitler, and even Pavelić after he obtained a state in 1941.

Ievhen Konovalets' was born on 14 June 1891 in the village of Zashkiv in eastern Galicia. He studied law at Lviv University before the First World War. In 1914 he was mobilized for the Austrian army, but was taken as a prisoner of war by the Russian army a year later. In November 1917, he fled to Kiev and fought in the Sich Riflemen until December 1919, when he was again taken prisoner and detained in a Polish POW camp in Lutsk. In 1920 Konovalets' moved to Czechoslovakia, where he and other veterans founded the UVO. He returned to the Second Polish Republic in 1921, but left in late 1922 and subsequently lived in Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. Konovalets' was a convinced supporter of terrorist acts, which he tried to promote and sell to the Ukrainian diaspora as the continuation of the "liberation struggle." He enjoyed authority among young and old radical nationalists, who in a leaflet from 1934 called him the "leader of the Ukrainian nation and the national revolution," but non-nationalist Ukrainians did not perceive him as their leader. Konovalets' maintained relations with many fascist European politicians. After a meeting with Hitler in 1933, according to Karol Grünberg and Bolesław Sprengel, he appealed to Ukrainians to support Hitler's politics in the East. The first leader of the UVO and OUN was assassinated on 23 May 1938 in Rotterdam by the NKVD agent Pavel Sudoplatov. His loss was mourned by

Ukrainian nationalists in Poland and Ukrainian communities in several European and non-European countries. Some of these communities erected artificial coffins, which were watched during the mourning commemorations by young nationalists dressed in folk costumes and uniforms.[89]

Andrii Mel'nyk, Konovalets' brother-in-law, was born on 12 December 1890 in the village of Volia Iakubova. He studied at the Vienna University of Natural Resources. Shortly after the outbreak of the First World War, Mel'nyk enlisted in the Austrian army. In 1916 he was arrested by Russians, and, like Konovalets', later fought in the Sich Riflemen. After the war, he stayed in the Second Republic. Although Mel'nyk was a UVO commandant, he did not engage in terrorist policies. He worked for the head of the Greek Catholic Church, Andrii Sheptyts'kyi, as the manager of his estates and was also the leader of the Catholic Action of Ukrainian Youth (*Katolyts'ka aktsiia ukraïns'koï molodi*, KAUM). After Konovalets' assassination, the OUN émigrés elected Mel'nyk as the new OUN leader against the will of the younger generation, which preferred Bandera but who at that time was in jail. Mel'nyk took an oath on 11 October 1938 in Vienna, but the title of *Vozhd'* was officially bestowed on him only at the Second General Congress of the OUN in Rome in August 1939. He did not hide his fascination with fascism and admiration for fascist Germany and Italy. In a letter to Ribbentrop from 2 May 1938, Mel'nyk claimed that the OUN was "ideologically akin to similar movements in Europe, especially to National Socialism in Germany and Fascism in Italy."[90] After the beginning of the Second World War, the younger generation rejected him as the OUN leader and joined the faction under the leadership of Bandera. Unlike Bandera, Mel'nyk was not arrested in July 1941. He collaborated with the Germans until his arrest in early 1944, and then again after being released in September 1944. In the last months of the Second World War, he prolonged his collaboration with the Germans as a member of the Ukrainian National Committee (*Ukraïns'kyi Natsional'nyi Komitet*, UNK), which had been established in late 1944 to mobilize Ukrainians to fight against the Soviet Union. After the war, Mel'nyk lived in Luxembourg and West Germany, dying on 1 November 1964.[91]

Stepan Bandera was almost twenty years younger than Konovalets' and Mel'nyk. He was born on 1 January 1909 in the eastern Galician village of Staryi Uhryniv, and experienced the First World War as a boy. Bandera attended a Ukrainian high school in Stryi and began his studies at the Agricultural and Forestry Department of the Lviv Polytechnic, but never finished them on account of his terrorist and political activities. In 1931, Bandera became the director of the propaganda apparatus of the homeland executive. In 1932, he became the deputy leader of the national executive,

and in 1933 its leader, a position that he retained until his arrest on 15 June 1934. During this period, the OUN killed more and more Ukrainians who were accused of treason, and performed several assassinations of Polish and Russian politicians. Bandera was a devoted revolutionary and fanatical ultranationalist; he became the symbol of his generation. During the two trials against the OUN in Warsaw and Lviv in 1935 and 1936, the younger generation celebrated him as their *Providnyk*. After escaping from prison in early September 1939, Bandera became the leader of the young OUN faction, whose members were known as Banderites, and who attempted to establish a Ukrainian state and make Bandera the leader of this state.[92]

Nevertheless, after the proclamation in Lviv on 30 June 1941, the Germans confined Bandera and took him to Berlin. They detained and kept Bandera as a special political prisoner in Berlin and Sachsenhausen until September 1944, when he, Mel'nyk, and several other Ukrainian politicians agreed to work for the UNK and to mobilize Ukrainians for war against the Red Army. After the war, Bandera lived in West Germany, collaborated with the American, British, and West German intelligence services, and stayed in contact with Francisco Franco, who invited him to resettle in Spain. The KGB assassinated Bandera in Munich on 15 October 1959. In the course of various political processes occurring during and after his life, Bandera became the most important symbol of Ukrainian nationalism. During the Cold War, he was commemorated by several communities of the Ukrainian diaspora in the Western bloc. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, his cult reemerged in western Ukraine.[93]

The Ukrainian language has two words for leader: *Providnyk* and *Vozhd'*. The latter also exists in Russian, and was used by Lenin and Stalin. In the 1920s and 1930s, *Vozhd'* had a more totalitarian meaning than *Providnyk* and was a more appropriate translation of *Duce* or *Führer*. The term *Vozhd'* appeared in central documents such as Stsibors'kyi's *Natsiokratia*. *Providnyk* meant at that time the leader of the entire organization, the leader of the homeland executive, or the leader of a combat unit. Konovalets' was called *Vozhd'* or *Providnyk*, depending on the context. In 1933–34, Bandera, as the leader of the homeland executive, was called *Providnyk*. At the Second General Congress of the OUN in Rome in August 1939, the title of *Vozhd'* was bestowed on Mel'nyk. In order to distinguish themselves from the OUN-M, Banderites referred to their leader as the *Providnyk*. Nevertheless, during the "Ukrainian National Revolution" that began on the same day as Operation Barbarossa, some sectors of the OUN-B, unaware of the policies of the OUN-B leadership, also referred to Bandera as *Vozhd'*. After the war, the term *Providnyk*

became more popular than *Vozhd'* and was used more frequently by people who commemorated Konovalets', Mel'nyk, and Bandera.

Racism

Racism in the context of Ukrainian radical nationalism was related to the idea of independence (*samostiinist'*). Ukrainian racist thinkers argued that Ukraine should become an independent state, because it was inhabited by a particular race that needed an independent nation state to develop all of its features. Although racism began playing a central role in Ukrainian nationalist discourses only in the 1930s, it had already become an integral part of Ukrainian modern nationalism by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The reception of racism and eugenics in Ukraine began long before the Ukrainian nationalists radicalized and began to perceive themselves as fascists. The first Ukrainian scholars and thinkers who adopted some elements of the European discourses about racism and eugenics were neither radical nationalists nor fascists, but their writings were later read by Ukrainian fascists who adapted them to their own needs, frequently without studying the academic context and intentions of the authors.

Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (1866–1934)—the most popular Ukrainian historian and author of the voluminous *History of Ukraine-Rus'*—seemed not to have directly inspired the OUN and UPA, but his writings are worth mentioning because of his intellectual impact on Ukrainian thinkers and politicians such as Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi (1873–1924) and Stepan Rudnyts'kyi (1887–1937). Both Mikhnovs'kyi and Rudnyts'kyi were extensively read by the OUN and UPA and substantially shaped their worldview and ideology.

While studying the early history of the Ukrainians, Hrushevs'kyi began looking for the origins of the Ukrainian nation among ancient peoples. He thereby attributed to his contemporary fellow Ukrainians certain features that he claimed to have deduced from their "ancient ancestors."[94] He argued that "the Slavs of today are predominantly short-headed" but racially not monolithic. While analyzing ancient and medieval descriptions of people living at that time in the Ukrainian territories, he pondered the ideal type of the historical Ukrainian and wrote that Ukrainians were "blond-haired, ruddy-skinned, and tall" and "very dirty" people.[95]

Mykola Mikhnovs'kyi was not a historian, but a politician based in Russian Ukraine. In his writings, he combined racism with national interpretations of Ukrainian history and anti-Russian, anti-Polish, and anti-Jewish discourses on

oppression and exploitation of the Ukrainian people. After the First World War, his publications inspired many young Ukrainian nationalists who endorsed fascism. In 1904, Mikhnovs'kyi presented some points of his political program in the "Ten Commandments of the UNP" for the Ukrainian National Party (*Ukraïns'ka Narodna Partia*, UNP). In the third commandment, he claimed "Ukraine for Ukrainians!" and in the tenth, "Do not marry a foreign woman because your children will be your enemies …"[96] He also demanded the territory "from the Carpathian Mountains to the Caucasus" for a Ukrainian state without "Russians, Poles, Magyars, Romanians, and Jews … as long as they rule over us and exploit us."[97] Stepan Bandera and other Ukrainian radical nationalists studied Mikhnovs'kyi's writings in their youth, and Stepan Lenkavs'kyi even invented his own commandments and called them the "Ten Commandments of a Ukrainian Nationalist."[98]

A more modern and space-oriented form of racism was shaped by the geographer Stepan Rudnyts'kyi (1887–1937), who worked together with Hrushevs'kyi on the concept of the origins of the Ukrainian nation.[99] Rudnyts'kyi provided Hrushevs'kyi's historical concept with the essential component of space: he defined the "natural territory" or "living space" of the Ukrainian nation and argued that "race" was, after "national territory," the second most important feature of the Ukrainian nation.[100]

Rudnyts'kyi claimed that the "Ukrainian race is beautiful" and that the Ukrainians possessed some important features, such as the "ability to live and struggle for the existence of a particular race." "The Ukrainian race," Rudnyts'kyi continued, "is very valuable. Tall height (Ukrainians belong to the tallest nations in Europe and the earth) and a huge chest circumference (perhaps the biggest in Europe) while being slender and agile make a Ukrainian very suitable for all physical work."[101]

The point of departure for this nationalist Ukrainian geographer and geopolitical thinker was the belief that "the good and wealth of nations depends much more on biological than on economic factors." For him, it was first of all race and biological predispositions and not the economic or cultural, social, and political circumstances that determined the well-being of a group. He claimed that race and "national biology" should enjoy absolute priority in the politics of a nation, because they would help to increase the number and strength of its people. Similarly, Rudnyts'kyi also admired and adopted eugenics, a very popular theory and science at that time, which claimed to analyze and be able to improve the genetic quality of the human population.[102]

Rudnyts'kyi divided mankind into races and races into nations, believing that a "national struggle and racial struggle [*borot'ba natsional'na i borot'ba rasova*]"

would free occupied nations and make them independent.[103] He understood such a free and independent nation in racist terms and defined it as:

> A large community of people, the shape of whose bodies is similar to that of each other, but different from those of other nations, [who] have their own independent and dissimilar mother language, which differs from other ones, their own native customs and rites, their own native history, common feeling of good and bad moments that they experienced together … and what is most important, have somewhere to live, that is, they inhabit a big and rich piece of the surface of the earth.[104]

For Rudnyts'kyi, therefore, race was the factor that made nations with similar languages and cultures dissimilar. This notion began to play a crucial role in the worldview of the Ukrainian nationalists. After centuries of co-existence with Poles in the western parts of Ukraine and with Russians in the eastern parts, the Ukrainian culture and language were extensively influenced by the Polish and Russian culture and language. Mixed marriages were common both among Poles and Ukrainians and among Ukrainians and Russians. Similarly, celebrations of rituals of other religious or ethnic groups were not unusual. Although the majority of Ukrainians, Poles, and Russians perceived this as the ordinary way of life, Rudnyts'kyi considered it to be a problem for creating a Ukrainian state. Thus, race was for him the solution to this problem. It could help the Ukrainians to distinguish themselves from their Polish, Russian, Jewish, and other neighbors and spouses and to identify the foes of their racial nation:

> As the soul of one man differs from the soul of another one, so the soul of one nation is different from another nation's. It is difficult for a Russian [*moskal'*] or a Pole to understand a Ukrainian not only because their languages are different but also because the souls of their nations are different. A Ukrainian looks differently at the world, freedom and fate than a Russian [*moskal'*] or a Pole does. Therefore it is very difficult for one nation to live in peace with another one. Neighbouring nations have never lived together in peace. On the contrary, just like the races so the nations wage fervent wars.[105]

Similarly to Stsibors'kyi, Rudnyts'kyi's main concern was the lack of a state in which the Ukrainians would not be treated as second-class citizens and could decide policies on their own. Yet he did not regard this as a question of international politics, national education, or the process of "inventing a nation," but addressed it by means of eugenics, racism, and Lebensraum theories. He argued that "nations are products of nature just like animals and plants."[106]

Rudnyts'kyi's attitude to the Jews and their coexistence with Ukrainians was complex. On the one hand, he stated that Ukrainian peasants, whom he highly prized for their racial features, were not correct if they believed that "intermingling with Jews is a crime." On the other, he condemned marriages with Jews from an academic point of view:

> But all neutral ethnologists, racial theoreticians and eulogists are in agreement and emphasize that the combination of Aryan nations with Jews is bad for both sides … Jews are physically absolutely weaker than Ukrainians … In addition to that one also has to mention that the Jewish race is weak but surprisingly firm and that the Jewish admixture appears very noticeably to the third, fourth and even further generations with all its bad physical consequences.[107]

In contradiction to marrying Jews, Rudnyts'kyi understood intermingling with "Aryan races" as beneficial for the Ukrainians: "Intermingling with racially more worthy nations (Scandinavians, Anglo-Saxons, Germans and other Slavs of Adriatic race [*slav"iany adryis'koï rasy*] are very rare among our intelligentsia. Pity! The profit from this would be enormous."[108]

This kind of racism extensively impacted the ideology and policies of the OUN and later the UPA, whose members and soldiers read Mikhnovskyi's and Rudnytskyi's writings and adapted their content to their own needs. It also significantly influenced the mass violence conducted by Ukrainian nationalists before, during, and after the Second World War. OUN member Mykola Sukhovers'kyi, who lived in Chernivtsi, recalled in his memoirs that the student fraternity *Zaporozhe* forbade its members to marry "an alien girl—a non-Ukrainian" after reading Mikhnovs'kyi's Decalogue.[109] At the Second Great Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists in March–April 1941, the OUN-B wanted to have a strong and healthy race in the state that it planned to establish: "The OUN struggles for a systematic organization of the national health by the Ukrainian state authority, and the growth and strength of the Ukrainian race."[110] In 1944, in reference to the writing of "Professor Dr. St. Rudnyts'kyi," the authors of the brochure "The Nation as a Species" came to the conclusion that a mixed marriage was a crime that should be punished: "The Ukrainian nation is against mixed marriage and regards it as a crime … The substance of our families must be Ukrainian (father, mother, and children). The family is the most important organic unity, the highest cell of the national collective, and thus we have to keep it purely Ukrainian."[111] During the ethnic cleansing of the Poles in 1943 and 1944, the UPA leadership demanded that Ukrainians in mixed marriages kill their spouses and children.[112]

Antisemitism

Ukrainian nationalists combined a modern, racialized concept of antisemitism with older "traditional" Ukrainian antisemitism, which was based on religion and pre-modern economic, social, and political circumstances. The racist antisemitism impacted Ukrainian nationalism in the late 1920s through the 1930s and was received to a great extent from the ideology of the German National Socialists. The "traditional" Ukrainian antisemitism was less aggressive but very deeply rooted in Ukrainian national culture, including the national literature. The Ukrainian national poet and writer Taras Shevchenko (1814–1861) portrayed Jews in his poem "Haidamaky" as the agents of Polish landowners and the brigands who killed Jews as national heroes.[113] This was not an exception, but rather a common understanding of the relationship between Jews and Ukrainians, which was familiar to most members of the UVO, OUN, and UPA. In their publications, they portrayed the Jews as agents of the Polish landlords and supporters of Polish and Russian nationalism in Ukraine.[114]

Between 1918 and 1921, 50,000 to 60,000 Jews were killed in numerous pogroms in central and eastern Ukraine by the troops of the Ukrainian People's Republic, the Russian White Army, anarchist peasant bands, and local Ukrainians.[115] Although pogroms did not take place in western Ukraine, their aftermath radicalized the attitude of the Ukrainian nationalists toward the Jews and made antisemitism into one of the most significant rudiments of Ukrainian nationalism. This radicalization was set into motion by the verdict of not guilty in the trial of Sholom Schwartzbard, who had murdered Symon Petliura in Paris on 25 May 1926. At the trial in Paris, Schwarzbard argued that he killed Petliura to avenge the pogroms that Petliura's army had conducted. The outcome of this process enraged many Ukrainian nationalists, who had turned Petliura into an important symbol of Ukrainian nationalism, notwithstanding the fact that Petliura had not been a supporter of radical nationalism and was previously disliked by them. In addition, they argued that Schwartzbard worked for the NKVD, although no evidence was found for this claim.[116]

Although Dontsov and some other ideologists of Ukrainian fascism believed that Russians were a more serious and dangerous enemy of Ukrainians than the Jews, they understood the Jews as pillars and agents of Russia and the Soviet Union. In reaction to the Petliura trial, Dontsov claimed that after solving the problem with Russian imperialism, the Ukrainians should deal with the Jewish question:

> This murder is an act of revenge by an agent of Russian imperialism against a person who became a symbol of the national struggle against Russian

oppression. It does not matter that in this case a Jew became an agent of Russian imperialism. … We have to and we will fight against the aspiration of Jewry to play the inappropriate role of lords in Ukraine. … No other government took as many Jews into its service as did the Bolsheviks, and one might expect that like Pilate the Russians will wash their hands and say to the oppressed nations, "The Jew is guilty of everything."

Jews are guilty, terribly guilty, because they helped consolidate Russian rule in Ukraine, but "the Jew is not guilty of everything." Russian imperialism is guilty of everything. Only when Russia falls in Ukraine will we be able to settle the Jewish question in our country in a way that suits the interest of the Ukrainian people.[117]

In terms of antisemitism, Mykola Stsibors'kyi was an exception among the ideologists of Ukrainian fascism. Because of his relationship with a Jewish woman, he began to adopt antisemitism only in the late 1930s under pressure from other nationalists. This change of attitude toward Jews was well illustrated by his publications. In the article "Ukrainian Nationalism and Jewry," published in 1930 in *Rozbudova Natsiï*, Stsibors'kyi wrote:

… the government's task will be to grant Jews equal status and an opportunity to appear in every sphere of social, cultural, and other activity. As for the fear that equality for Jews may harm the state, it must be kept in mind that Jews are not the kind of national minority in Ukraine that could have subjective reasons for being hostile in principle to our independence. On the contrary, favorable conditions for existence and involvement in the maelstrom of state and social life—all this will help to create in the Jewish masses a feeling not only of loyalty but also at a later time of conscious patriotism …[118]

In 1934, Konovalets' informed Stsibors'kyi that "mixed marriages with Jews" were unacceptable because the Jews are "foes of our rebirth."[119] It is not known how Stsibors'kyi would solve this dilemma, but in 1938 he claimed that in the future Ukrainian state we would have to deal with the "alien national elements (almost all of them hostile to us) from the urban and industrial centers."[120] In 1939, he wrote that the "large part of the Russian, Polish, and other immigrants" would be killed in the first stages of the revolution.[121] That same year, he denied Jews the right of citizenship in his draft of a constitution for a Ukrainian state.[122]

Racist antisemitism appeared in Ukrainian nationalist discourses in the late 1920s and began to dominate in the second half of the 1930s. In the article "Jews, Zionism and Ukraine," first published in 1929 in the OUN paper *Rozbudova Natsiï*, Iurii Mylianych discussed how to "solve the Jewish problem" in Ukraine while

insisting that it "*must* be solved." Mylianych calculated that "more than 2 million Jews who are an alien and many of them even a hostile element of the Ukrainian national organism live in the Ukrainian territories," stating that it "is impossible to calculate all those damages and obstructions that the Jews caused to our liberation struggle." He characterized the Jews as the "sources of denationalization" and wrote that "in addition to a number of external enemies Ukraine also has an internal enemy—Jewry." Finally, he could not decide how the Ukrainians should "solve the Jewish problem" and only asked some rhetorical questions: "Should we allow them further to exploit the Ukrainian national organism? Assimilate them, take them in the national organism, hold them, take them in, amalgamate with them? Remove them from Ukraine? How? Expel them? Where? It is not easy to expel two million people or to get rid of them altogether. Nobody needs this good, everybody is only happy to get rid of them."[123]

The OUN ideologist Volodymyr Martynets' was one of the most important Ukrainian promoters of racist antisemitism. In the brochure *The Jewish Problem in Ukraine*, published in 1938 in London, he made it clear that he admired the Nuremberg Laws passed in 1935 and felt that Ukrainians needed similar racist regulations. Martynets' argued that Jews were an alien race in every country in which they lived and thus were a problem for a number of countries around the globe. Those Jews who assimilated in countries such as Italy and Germany endangered them no less than non-assimilated Jews, because they could contaminate the blood of the people. According to Martynets', no other nation had a more serious problem with the Jews than the Ukrainians, because no other country had more Jews living in it than Ukraine.[124]

Martynets' demanded that Ukrainians should begin dealing with this problem immediately and not wait until they established a state.[125] He argued that the "Jewish problem" could be solved only by means of isolation and racial policies. Because Ukrainians did not have a state, they could not pass racist laws and thus should practice isolation and separation. Jews should have their own schools, newspapers, restaurants, cafes, theatres, brothels, and cabarets and should not use the Ukrainian ones. Intermarriage between Jews and Ukrainians had to be stopped. This isolation of the "Jewish race" would allow the Ukrainians to achieve two goals. First, the Jewish race would not corrupt the Ukrainian race and cause deterioration of its racial values. Second, isolation would decrease the number of Jews in Ukraine and finish their "parasitic existence." Ukrainians would then begin taking up such professions as tavern owners, doctors, professors, and traders.[126]

Rituals

Stanisławów: Parade of Ukrainian youth in folk costumes in honor of Hans Frank, October 1941. Image courtesy of Narodowe Archiwum Cyfrowe, syg. 2-3024.

Rituals practised by the Ukrainian nationalists had a different form than those fashioned by movements that established regimes in national states. The Ukrainian nationalists performed many of their rituals at small, often illegal gatherings or in the underground. With the exception of the period of the "Ukrainian National Revolution" in summer 1941, the OUN could not organize large rallies and marches as the Italian Fascists or the German National Socialists did because of the lack of a state. Political rituals of the Ukrainian nationalists were more closely related to

religion and folklore than in Italy and Germany, and more closely resembled rituals invented by the Iron Guard and the Hlinka Party. In general, however, Ukrainian nationalism seems to have been no less ritualized than other fascist movements.

Essential for the Ukrainian nationalists were dead soldiers, mainly those who were killed in the First World War. Similarly important were nationalist activists who were killed by political and ethnic "enemies of the Ukrainian nation." These individuals were turned by means of propaganda into martyrs and heroes and presented as brave fighters who fell for their country, even if they were killed during bank or post office robberies. The actual reasons for their death and the criminal pasts of some of them were ignored or denied. At the sites of battles and burials, nationalists frequently erected mounds in the company of local villagers. These were usually sanctified by priests and used for conducting nationalist commemorations or demonstrations, frequently on 1 November in reference to the proclamation of the West Ukrainian National Republic (*Zakhidno-Ukraïns'ka Narodna Respublika*, ZUNR) in Lviv on 1 November 1918, or on Pentecost (*Zeleni Sviata*). The commemorations began with a *panakhyda* (memorial service) and continued with political speeches, sometimes delivered by priests. Politics and religion were entirely blurred during these commemorations. The OUN also motivated the villagers to erect symbolic mounds in places where Ukrainian soldiers were not killed. This allowed people who did not live near the actual places of battles to gather and commemorate their "fallen heroes" at symbolic sites. In the interwar period, Polish authorities frequently destroyed the mounds. This caused local conflicts, fights, and even small battles between the Polish authorities and local Ukrainians.[127]

In order to transform the dead soldiers and OUN activists into martyrs, Ukrainian nationalists needed religion and priests. Thus, they frequently involved priests in diverse nationalist commemorations and instructed them to provide the political rituals with an aura of holiness. The OUN enjoyed support from the Greek Catholic Church, and there were also several OUN members among the Greek Catholic priests. One of the most devoted radical nationalists among the Greek Catholic priests was Ivan Hryn'okh, who acted as a liaison between the Greek Catholic Church and the leadership of the OUN. In the last few years before the Second World War, Hryn'okh and other Greek Catholic priests organized in collaboration with the OUN in Lviv several huge panakhydas and nationalist commemorations in honor of prominent nationalists, including the first OUN leader Konovalets', who was assassinated on 23 May 1938 in Rotterdam.[128] Two of the best known OUN martyrs, in whose memory large religious and nationalist celebrations were organized annually, were Vasyl' Bilas and Dmytro Danylyshyn. Both were executed on 22 December 1932 for killing

the Polish politician Tadeusz Hołówko. Shortly after the execution, the propaganda apparatus of the national executive headed by Stepan Bandera organized services with priests in hundreds of localities for the two executed young Ukrainians.[129]

The fascist greeting "Glory to Ukraine!" (*Slava Ukraïni!*) had been invented in the early 1920s by the League of Ukrainian Fascists, which later merged with the OUN.[130] The UVO and OUN activists adopted and used this fascist salute, but it is difficult to estimate how frequently. During the trials against several OUN members in 1935 and 1936 in Warsaw and Lviv, some of the OUN defendants from the younger generation performed the greeting in the courtroom frequently. The punishment for performing the salutes in court only elevated the status of this greeting among Ukrainian nationalists.[131]

"Glory to the Leader!" (*Vozhdevi Slava!*), another fascist greeting, was introduced by the leadership in exile at the Second Great Congress of the OUN in Rome on 27 August 1939.[132] After the split into the OUN-B and the OUN-M, however, the OUN-B introduced another Ukrainian fascist salute at the Second Great Congress of the Ukrainian Nationalists in Cracow in March and April 1941. This was the most popular Ukrainian fascist salute and had to be performed according to the instructions of the OUN-B leadership by raising the right arm "slightly to the right, slightly above the peak of the head" while calling "Glory to Ukraine!" (*Slava Ukraïni!*) and responding "Glory to the Heroes!"(*Heroiam Slava!*).[133]

Folklore and folk costumes were other significant elements of Ukrainian nationalism, similarly to other East Central European movements such as the Iron Guard and the Hlinka Party.[134] The folk costumes were worn for commemorations and rallies and during pogroms. For example, during the official celebrations of the Waffen-SS Galizien division—which had been established in the spring of 1943 and was composed of 8,000 Ukrainian volunteers—women and men, dressed in embroidered costumes marched next to Ukrainians in Waffen-SS Galizien uniforms. They performed fascist salutes in front of the German generals and the leaders of the UTsK, who usually stood on a podium. During these celebrations, they also greeted the Germans with bread and salt.[135] Two years before those parades, in the summer of 1941 during the "Ukrainian National Revolution" organized by the OUN-B, some Ukrainians had been seen wearing folk costumes while persecuting and murdering Jews during pogroms.[136] At that time, many German troops were welcomed by Ukrainians dressed in embroidered shirts and dresses. For example, General Karl von Roques was welcomed enthusiastically on 30 June 1941 in Dobromyl by a dressed-up crowd and was asked to deliver a speech. Every time he mentioned the name "Adolf Hitler," the people in embroidered shirts and dresses

became delirious and clapped.[137] In August 1941, when the OUN still hesitated as to whether or not to collaborate with the Nazis, a parade was organized in Stanislaviv (Stanisławów). Ukrainians dressed in folk costumes welcomed Hans Frank, the governor of the General Government, while marching in front of him and other Nazis, and collectively performing fascist salutes.[138]

Religion

Among the churches in Ukraine, it was the Greek Catholic Church that became a kind of Ukrainian national church in eastern Galicia, which was the center of Ukrainian radical nationalism. Many OUN activists were Greek Catholics, such as Ievhen Konovalets'; several others such as Stepan Bandera, Stepan Lenkavs'kyi, Iaroslav Stets'ko, and Myron Matviieiko were the sons of Greek Catholic priests or worked for the Greek Catholic Church, as did Andrii Mel'nyk. The Greek Catholic religion was an important component of the Ukrainian Galician identity. Dontsov called Ukrainian nationalism the "ersatz-religion of secular gods."[139] Bandera claimed after the Second World War: "Without a doubt, the Ukrainian nationalist liberating-revolutionary movement, as directed and formed by the OUN, is a Christian movement."[140]

In 1929, OUN member Stepan Lenkavs'kyi drafted the "Ten Commandments of a Ukrainian Nationalist," known also as "The Decalogue of a Ukrainian Nationalist." Lenkavs'kyi's Decalogue blurred the boundaries between national radicalism and religion and undermined religious morality with ideological immorality. In this document, he tried to combine fascism with religion or to transform them into something that scholars of fascism call political religion; the OUN called it the "new religion" or the "religion of Ukrainian nationalism."[141] The promotion of violence was an intrinsic element of this operation. The seventh commandment of the Decalogue stated in the original version: "You should not hesitate to commit the greatest crime if the good of the cause requires it." Later the words "the greatest crime" (*naibil'shyi zlochyn*) were replaced with "the most dangerous task."[142]

Mykola Konrad, professor at the Theological Academy of Lviv, published in 1934 the brochure *Nationalism and Catholicism*, which illustrated how a contemporary Ukrainian intellectual tried to combine nationalism or fascism with religion.[143] Konrad began his essay with the statement that nationalism, unlike

internationalism, is natural and human. It is a part of human nature, not least because it is in total agreement with religion:

> Nationalism, in the older sense, means an idea or view that considers the division of mankind into nations right and proper and gives them the full right to the most advanced development.
>
> By internationalism we mean an idea that condemns the division of mankind into nations and aspires to remove national differences between people and to establish cosmopolitans who feel that they belong to the whole of mankind. Such were the stoics in the old times, and now the socialists and communists aspire toward this.
>
> Nationalism in the above-mentioned sense is in agreement with Catholic ethics and sound philosophy. *The law of nature and the good of the mankind demand such nationalism.*[144]

"The law of nature" Konrad argued further, "demands social life between people. As a result of such coexistence common descent, community of blood, community of race, common language, common territory, customs, traditions, experiences, culture, religion, and statehood emerge … in short, a nation is formed."[145] Likewise, as a result of those processes, a "national spirit" comes into being and provides the nation with "power and unity." According to Konrad, "one can call the nation an extended family."[146] Mankind, according to the Lviv professor, cannot exist without nations, because "nationalism in the general meaning demands the good of all mankind." Mankind is an organism, and the nations are its organs.[147]

Fascism was for Konrad "modern nationalism" or simply "nationalism." The Lviv professor argued: "Italian fascism and similar movements are a manifestation of [modern] nationalism."[148] Some of the most significant features of modern nationalism were, according to him, "racism, biological structure, revolution of the spirit, irrationalism, voluntarism, the factors of instincts, violence."[149] Also, racist antisemitism was for him an integral part of "modern nationalism": "In modern nationalism *nationalist egoism* achieved the highest degree of the absolute; instead of assimilation the slogan of the purity of the nation was advanced with a particular antisemitic tendency."[150]

Like Dontsov, Konrad argued that Ukrainian nationalism belongs to the same kind of movements as Italian Fascism and German National Socialism, but, also like Dontsov, he did not insist on labeling it as "fascism." Similarly, he called Italian Fascism and German National Socialism not fascist, but forms of "modern

nationalism." Sir Oswald Mosley, the leader of the British Union of Fascists, was for Konrad not a fascist but a nationalist. The different "modern nationalisms" were united by race and racism, which, according to the Lviv professor, emerged in reaction to communism.[151] In this context, Konrad provided an important definition of Ukrainian fascism:

> *Ukrainian modern nationalism* emerged from the military spirit of the fighters for the freedom of Ukraine and aims to establish by revolutionary means an independent united Ukrainian state. It is the liberation movement of an oppressed nation. It emerged during the liberation struggles and in 1920 found its first organisational shape in the so-called "Party of National Work" with its ideological organ called *Zahrava*. At that time fascism was taking its first steps, and nobody had even heard of Hitlerism. In 1925 the Ukrainian nationalist movement spread through the ranks of the student youth and struggled relentlessly against communist organizations which [at that time] dominated among Ukrainian students. After the relentless struggles the nationalists prevailed and came under the spiritual of Dontsov.[152]

Dontsov was for Konrad not only a thinker who applied Nietzsche's theory to the Ukrainian reality, but also an intellectual who was as great as the eccentric German philosopher.[153] The Lviv theologian praised the leading Ukrainian ideologist of fascism for his uncompromising, aggressive, and stirring writings: "Dontsov's nationalism attempts to cultivate a high spiritual level of uncritical thinking by awakening instincts, passion, hatred toward enemies, the most advanced rapacity, and by activating a vigorous elite that by means of violence and unscrupulous terror, 'with knife and blood,' will impose its will upon the masses."[154] Similarly, Konrad admired Dontsov's concept of amorality and agreed that the nation is a living organism: "The nation constitutes the highest organization of life. It is a living organism that has its own history, psychology, and culture and is the product of its own race…."[155] Moreover, he believed that a nation state needs a regime based on values such as race: "Nationalism rejects democratic forms of government and parties and tries to implement in nations political and social culture and moral-custom discipline in the name of national instincts, race, love to homeland etc."[156]

Following Dontsov, Konrad also argued that Nietzsche laid out the basis of nationalism and was an "opponent of democracy," which the Lviv professor called the "enemy of mankind."[157] The only aspect of Nietzsche's philosophy that he did not like was its profane and secular character. Yet he claimed that another thinker whom he highly admired, "Dr. Joseph Goebbels, one of the leading representatives of the national socialist movement in Germany," knew how to deal with Nietzsche's

dislike of religion.[158] Similarly, he also believed that Hitler valued religion and would use it in the struggle against Marxism:

> And so, during the elections on 1 February 1933, Hitler declared in the name of the entire government in a radio speech that "he is declaring a war for life or death against Marxism, which is destroying the family, the ideas of honour and faithfulness, nation, fatherland, and *even the eternal foundations of all faith and morality*. The [German] national government … *will strongly defend Christianity as the basis of all morality, and family, as the organic cell of our state and nation*."[159]

After a long and careful introduction of Ukrainian "modern nationalism," Konrad argued that "nationalism and contemporary Catholicism are closely related in their idealism and activism."[160] He viewed them as powerful remedies against all evil ideas and political systems, such as democracy and socialism. In combination, they could lead to revolutions and rebirths and establish clerical fascist regimes, not only in Ukraine but in many other countries around the globe, and thus improve the well-being of mankind:

> Nationalism and Catholicism are powerful allies in the struggle against liberalism and socialism.
>
> The imperative of the twentieth century is to gather a new vigorous, enthusiastic elite, and to put it under the leadership of competent and strong leaders, to push the masses to action, a decisive and victorious fight against the rotten spirit of capitalism and against satanic communism, and to renew private, domestic, national, and state life on the principles of Christian justice and love.[161]

The "*sword and cross* are the hope of the mankind for a new better tomorrow." Those who "separate these two elements … are the enemies of healthy and true nationalism."[162] In other words: "*Religion is the root of nationalist culture and greatness* because everything godless, profane is antinational and harms the nation; everything religious supports it …"[163]

Konrad finished his essay in a symbolic way. He praised National Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy for concluding concordats with the Vatican and ended with the words: "May God grant that these two idealisms—the Catholic 'I believe' and the nationalist 'I want'—merge harmoniously as the two clear tones of the Ukrainian soul into one accord and awaken our withered hearts. Then a new era of faith, love, and power, a mighty national unity and a unified invincible front will come into being."[164]

Revolution

Fascist movements perceived themselves as revolutionary movements and revolution as a part of establishing a new political order. In the interwar period, Ukrainian nationalists elaborated two concepts of revolution: "permanent revolution" and "national revolution." These concepts were interrelated, but not identical. It was thought that the "permanent revolution" should prepare the masses for the "national revolution." During the latter revolution, the nationalists intended to take power in the Ukrainian territories and establish an authoritarian state of a fascist type.

In 1930 an anonymous author published in the official OUN journal *Surma* the article "Permanentna revolutsiia," in which he explained both concepts of revolution. He also elaborated on why Ukrainians should follow the OUN and obey it during the revolutionary times. The author first stated that because Ukrainians did not succeed in establishing a state toward the end of the First World War, many Ukrainians— according to him, "traitors"—began cooperating with the occupiers of Ukraine. These "traitors" also wanted to establish a state, but in a peaceful and "legal" way. They tried to achieve more rights for Ukrainians and improve the political, social, and cultural situation of Ukrainians in Poland, and they waited for a convenient moment such as an international conflict during which the state could be established. In Poland they were elected to the Polish parliament, and in the Soviet Union they supported the politics of Ukrainization. Yet they forgot that "our enemies are not our friends," and they collaborated with people who "conquered our territories, rushed to liquidate us as a nation and turn us into physical and moral slaves."[165]

A nation could, the anonymous author argued, establish a state only in a "bloody fight, war or revolution." Every kind of cooperation with the "occupiers" was counterproductive and harmful to the national cause. This was how, according to the author, Poles, Finns, Irishmen, Lithuanians, Czechs, Germans, Italians, Americans, Englishmen and other people "achieved independence" and also how the Ukrainians should act:

> *We will also achieve our state in a bloody fight*. When we lose one liberation struggle, we will prepare ourselves for another one. If we lose the second, maybe we will win the third. … Ultimately we must win! The Poles lost two insurgencies, the Finns lost a revolution in 1905, the nations oppressed by Austria lost the revolution of 1848, the Irishmen were struggling continually for several decades and were losing. But eventually all of them won. We, too, will win! The blood of tens of thousands of people has already flowed for the liberty of Ukraine. This will not be for nothing![166]

The crucial element of both revolutions was the masses, i.e. devoted admirers who were ready to follow the OUN into battle. The nationalists knew that they could not win the fight against the "occupiers" and create a state in which they would establish a nationalist or fascist dictatorship without the support of the Ukrainians: "*A national insurgency*, and not a palace revolution, *but a revolution of the whole nation, has to be prepared among the broad masses by revolutionary means*, and not by 'loyalty,' 'real politics,' 'compromises,' 'legality'—in general not by peace." To achieve this, they needed to teach Ukrainians how to lose the fear of war and explain to them that fighting against the "occupiers" and all kind of political and ethnic "enemies" was in their own interest.[167]

To take away the fear of death from ordinary Ukrainians, the anonymous author suggested, the nationalists should glamorize war and violence with the help of history. All Ukrainian history, according to him, consisted of bloody war and revolution, which became integral features of the Ukrainian national tradition and thus a part of Ukrainian culture, identity, and self-awareness: "all the bright moments of our nation, moments of its development, all of them are tragic, cruel, unsettled. ... But all this was not for nothing! All this survives in the awareness of the nation, and constitutes its historical tradition …" Thus, this author proposed that Ukrainians should understand that the UVO—which worked on the "permanent revolution" and prepared the Ukrainians for the "national revolution"—belonged to the Ukrainian tradition and was a "bright moment" of Ukrainian history. The Ukrainians should not be afraid of the revolutionary nationalists, but should trust and follow them and regard war and crime as part of their national traditions.[168]

The revolution must happen, the anonymous author argued, because Ukrainians did not have any other option. If they did not follow the UVO into the "bloody struggle," their enemies would keep exploiting and oppressing them. Only the revolution, or a bloody war, could stop them and liberate the Ukrainians:

> There will be victims on our side! But do we have no victims at the moment? The enemy lives from our bloody suffering [*kervavytsi*], impoverishes the whole nation, fills prisons, dishonors our sanctities—churches and graves of those who fell for liberty, tortures women and the elderly, orphans children. In the name of what is this happening? Is it not better to sacrifice a hundred times more victims in the fight against him [the enemy] for our future, and for his annihilation? No amount of victims would be too high if it comes to the life and honour of the nation. These victims will be not for nothing![169]

Ukrainians who would not support the movement and participate in its revolution but "want peace, agreement, freedom, or would give up the faith of their

parents" would be "resettled on the indigenous Polish territory," together with the Poles.[170]

The UVO and later the OUN were performing the "permanent revolution" throughout the entire interwar period, while preparing the masses for the bloody uprising—the "national revolution." This "national revolution" was planned to be executed for the first time in early 1934, and the *Providnyk* Bandera and his homeland executive were to implement it. When Germany attacked Poland on 1 September 1939, the OUN again considered conducting a "national revolution." Nevertheless, it decided not to because it was not well enough prepared and was too weak to defeat the Soviet forces that marched into western Ukraine on 17 September 1939. However, while collaborating with Nazi Germany in the General Government, the OUN-B prepared itself and the masses for the next revolution—the "Ukrainian National Revolution." It began on 22 June 1941, the day that Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union, and resulted in bloody pogroms during which Jews were killed by Germans, local Ukrainians, and the OUN-B militia. During the revolution, the OUN-B proclaimed a state, but did not succeed in keeping it. Nazi leaders did not approve of the Ukrainian state, as was also the case with the Lithuanian state proclaimed by the LAF in Kaunas on 23 June 1941. Nazi leaders had other plans for the countries in this part of Europe, and thus arrested the OUN-B leaders and collaborated with other Ukrainians such as Volodymyr Kubiiovych. After the summer of 1941, the Ukrainian nationalists did not engage in preparing further revolutions, but they cleansed the Ukrainian territories of non-Ukrainian elements, which was one of the most important goals of the "Ukrainian National Revolution."[171]

Becoming Genocidal

"Genocide" is a contested concept that makes more sense in legal than academic discourses.[172] The notion has been abused by political activists to promote the narrative of victimization or to elevate the political statutes of crimes, frequently with comparison to the Holocaust.[173] This study distances itself from such an understanding of genocide and instead uses the concept to analyze the intentions of perpetrators who consider, plan, or attempt the annihilation of a community because of its national or ethnic identity. The OUN and UPA leaders wanted to establish a homogenous Ukrainian nation state and used mass violence to achieve this aim. In

analyzing the policies of the OUN and UPA and their mass violence against national minorities, it is necessary to elaborate on the question of whether the nationalists intended to exterminate the entire Jewish and/or Polish communities in western Ukraine, attempted to do so, were involved in the genocide of the Jews in Ukraine that was initiated and conducted by the Germans, or adapted the genocidal policies and methods of the Germans to their own needs. Furthermore, the moment should be identified when mass violence started to play a significant role in OUN ideology and when the OUN and UPA began to use it as a political means.

The exact number of people killed by the Ukrainian nationalists in the interwar period is unknown, and can be only estimated at several hundred. At that time, the OUN targeted political opponents such as the journalist Sydir Tverdokhlib; OUN members accused of collaborating with the Poles, such as Iakiv Bachyns'kyi; Polish politicians who tried to reconcile the Poles with the Ukrainians, such as Tadeusz Hołówko; Russians such as the secretary of the Soviet consulate in Lviv, Aleksei Mailov; Jews killed for economic and ideological reasons; and many ordinary people killed during bank, post, or household robberies. The most important personality whom the Ukrainian nationalists attempted to assassinate was Józef Piłsudski, who, a few years after the failed attempt of 1921, became the leader of the Polish state. The most prominent person whom the radical nationalists actually succeeded in murdering was the Polish interior minister Bronisław Pieracki, who was assassinated on 15 June 1934 in Warsaw by OUN member Hryhorii Matseiko.[174]

During the interwar period, several Ukrainian nationalist ideologists discussed how to use ethnic and political mass violence to establish a homogenous state. The most important of these ideologists was Mykhailo Kolodzins'kyi (1902–1939), a leading OUN member who trained Ukrainian nationalists together with the Ustaša in a camp in Italy in 1933–1934. In this camp, Kolodzins'kyi met Ante Pavelić and began writing "The War Doctrine of the Ukrainian Nationalists," a document that elaborated on the concept of an "uprising" against the "occupiers" of Ukraine. This text showed how mass violence became a central element of OUN plans and politics, as well as how the nationalists combined racism with mass violence, began to invent genocidal scenarios for Ukraine, and which role imperialism played in the ideology and policies of the Ukrainian nationalists. Kolodzins'kyi worked on "The War Doctrine" for a few years and presented different versions of it at various meetings and congresses. In one of the earliest versions of the document, he wrote that Ukrainians needed mass violence to "physically protect their race." According to him, it was socialism and the reading of Karl Marx that made Ukrainians weak

and vulnerable. To overcome this crisis, the nationalists should awaken the "war instinct" of their people.[175]

Ukrainian imperialism in Kazakhstan was intended to weaken the Soviet Union and subordinate the Kazakhs to Ukrainians, but Kolodzins'kyi's main objective was to explain how the Ukrainians should deal with the Poles and Jews in western Ukraine during the uprising.[176] "Our uprising is not intended to change only the political order. It should cleanse Ukraine of the alien and hostile element and of our own miserable elements. Only during an uprising will we have the possibility to cleanse western Ukraine of the entire Polish element and thereby to finish the Polish claims to the Polish character of this territory." By "cleansing the territory" of the Poles, Kolodzins'kyi understood mass killings and expulsion. "We should remember," he continued reasoning, "that the more alien elements will be killed during the uprising, the easier it will be to rebuild the Ukrainian state and the stronger it will be."[177]

If with regard to the Poles, Kolodzins'kyi assumed both expulsion and mass killings, with regard to the Jews he planned only murder: "The OUN uprising is intended to destroy all living hostile elements in the Ukrainian territory … Slaughtering a half million Jews during the uprising will not be possible, as some nationalists say. Obviously, the hatred of the Ukrainian people for the Jews will be particularly horrible. We do not intend to temper this hatred, on the contrary we should inflate it, because the more Jews will be killed during the uprising, the better for the Ukrainian state, [and also] because the Jews are the only minority which we will not be able to denationalize."[178]

This kind of reasoning about Jews and Poles demonstrated that Ukrainian radical nationalism created genocidal aspirations by the second half of the 1930s. These ideological changes were closely related to Ukrainian radical nationalism's reception of fascism and perception of itself as a fascist and racist movement. Kolodzins'kyi's writings about mass violence were taken seriously by the leaders of the OUN, who saw the uprising—which they also called the revolution—as the central step toward a Ukrainian state. Conducting an uprising was, however, dependent on international politics and became possible only after the outbreak of the Second World War.[179]

Between 1 and 17 September 1939, during the time of the political vacuum in western Ukraine, the OUN murdered about 2,000 Poles in eastern Galicia, about 1,000 Poles in Volhynia, and an unknown number of Jews and political opponents.[180] The killings of these "enemies" were not on a mass scale during that time, because the political circumstances did not enable the OUN to conduct an uprising and build a state, and because the OUN was not prepared to carry out an uprising at that time. After the Soviets marched into western Ukraine on 17 September 1939, some

OUN members went underground, while others left for the General Government. There they collaborated with the Germans and prepared the actual uprising—the "Ukrainian National Revolution."[181]

On 22 June 1941, after several months of careful preparations, the OUN-B began the "Ukrainian National Revolution." Mass violence against Jews, Poles, Russians, Soviets, and Ukrainian political enemies was a central aim of the revolution, along with the plan to establish a Ukrainian state. During this uprising, the OUN-B, and especially its militia, organized pogroms together with Germans, during which they incited ordinary Ukrainians to murder Jews. The OUN-B militia also supported the Einsatzkommandos during the first mass shootings. Alexander Kruglov estimated that in July 1941, between 38,000 and 39,000 Jews were killed in pogroms and mass shootings in western Ukraine.[182]

In the late summer of 1941, the Germans redeployed the Ukrainian militia as the Ukrainian police. The Germans did not want a police force that would pursue its own political goals and tried to purge it of OUN-B members, but many OUN-B members remained in the police by concealing their association. In the following months, more and more Ukrainian nationalists joined the police.[183] The Ukrainian police in Volhynia and eastern Galicia were deeply involved in the annihilation of the Jews. They assisted the Einsatzkommandos and the Sicherheitspolizei with the mass shootings, guarded Jews in the ghettos, hunted Jews who escaped from the ghettos, and helped the Germans to dissolve ghettos and transport Jews to extermination camps. The Ukrainian policemen did not coordinate the genocide of the Jews in western Ukraine, but the Germans were dependent on them and could not have exterminated the Jews as efficiently as they did without their help.[184]

In March and April 1943, 5,000 Ukrainian policemen with experience in mass killings deserted to the UPA, which had been formed a few months before by the OUN-B.[185] At that time, the mass violence of the UPA against the Polish population in Volhynia escalated, and the UPA was killing several hundred to several thousand civilians per week. In early 1944, the UPA began to "cleanse" eastern Galicia of the Poles. Altogether, in 1943 and 1944 the OUN and UPA, with the assistance of their sympathizers and Ukrainians who were promised the land and property of the Poles or were forced to support them, murdered between 70,000 and 100,000 Polish civilians in these two regions.[186] At the same time, the Germans, UPA, OUN-B, and Ukrainian peasants also killed several thousand Jews who survived the ghettos or slave labor camps and hid in the forests and various hideouts in the countryside.[187] The anti-Polish violence in western Ukraine ceased gradually when the Soviets came to the territory in the spring and summer of 1944 and began to resettle the Poles to

the northern and western territories of Poland. In analyzing the plans and conduct of the OUN and UPA toward the Poles during 1943 and 1944, it is difficult to ascertain whether the nationalists intended to exterminate all Poles in these territories or whether they applied mass violence to force them to leave. Their main objective seems to have been to "cleanse" the territory.[188]

After the Soviet authorities again established themselves in western Ukraine, the UPA continued killing "unfaithful" Ukrainians who cooperated with the new authorities or who were accused of such cooperation, among them many newcomers from eastern Ukraine. By the early 1950s, the nationalists had killed about 20,000 civilians and 10,000 Soviet fighters. During this time, the forces of the Soviet authorities killed, according to their own documents, 153,000 Ukrainian nationalists, members of their families, and Ukrainian civilians. Additionally, they arrested 134,000 people, and deported 203,000 to the Gulag and Siberia. In so doing, they outdid the Ukrainian nationalists in terms of mass violence and terror, which substantially impacted the memory of radical and genocidal Ukrainian nationalism among western Ukrainians. By the time of *perestroika*, they began to commemorate the Ukrainian nationalists as "freedom fighters," and regarded the idea that Ukrainian nationalism had been a form of fascism as Soviet or anti-Ukrainian propaganda.[189]

Conclusion

After the First World War, fascism manifested itself in all European and many non-European countries and stateless national communities. It took various forms and adjusted to different cultural, social, and political situations. In Ukraine, the Ukrainian nationalists united in the OUN, adopted many elements of transnational fascist discourse, considered themselves to belong to the family of European fascist movements, and invented their own version of fascism. The OUN substantially radicalized Ukrainian nationalism and transformed it gradually into an extreme and genocidal ideology that combined the notion of liberation and independence with the policies of mass violence. The OUN planned to establish a homogenous Ukrainian nation state that would be an integral part of the "New Europe," similar to Tiso's Slovakia or Pavelić's Croatia.

Although the OUN emphasized that it was the same type of movement as the German National Socialists or Italian Fascists, it avoided the term "fascist" and preferred the word "nationalist," because it made it easier to avoid being labeled

as agents of a foreign or international movement. Such an attitude toward fascism was typical of several other movements in East Central Europe. The Hlinka Party, for example, argued that its policies were not fascist but "our very own" (*svojský*) or uniquely Slovak.[190] Similarly, to avoid the accusation of serving an international movement, the OUN emphasized the importance of Ukrainian traditions and national history. It also based its ideology on religion and integrated many religious elements into its rituals, in order to involve as many Ukrainians as possible and to appear as an integral element of the Ukrainian people.

Using a convenient political moment, the OUN proclaimed a state in June 1941. It followed the example of the Hlinka Party and the Ustaša, but unlike the Slovak and Croatian fascists, the OUN could not keep its state. The Nazi leaders' plans for Ukraine differed from those for Slovakia and Croatia, and they did not maintain close relations with the leadership of the OUN prior to the proclamation. Following their arrests in summer 1941, the leaders of the OUN shared the fate of the Iron Guard, who fled from Romania and were detained in German concentration camps as political prisoners or special political prisoners in circumstances similar to those of the OUN. Tiso's Slovakia and Pavelić's Croatia, on the other hand, were by no means independent, but rather puppet states of Nazi Germany. Despite their conflict with the leaders of Nazi Germany, the attitude of the Ukrainian nationalists toward mass violence did not change, and this did not affect their plans to "cleanse" Ukraine of their ethnic and political "enemies."

The OUN could not establish its own extermination camps as the Ustaša did, and it could not deport Jews to extermination camps in Poland as the Hlinka Party did. Nevertheless, it sent its members to the police who helped the Germans to exterminate the Jews, and it founded the UPA, which massacred the Poles. To some extent, these were the same nationalists who first massacred the Jews and then, after deserting in spring 1943 from the police to the UPA, "cleansed" the Ukrainian territories of Poles and hidden Jews. The OUN and UPA did not commit genocide on their own, but they helped the Germans to conduct genocide against the Jews, and they also killed thousands of Poles while following an ideology that approved of genocide and was fascist in nature.

*Editor's note: Certain words and phrases in direct quotations throughout the monograph have been changed from the original in bold to italics, in order to confirm stylistically. The emphases remain as the original authors intended.

Endnotes

1. For brief analyses of various apologetic and euphemistic representations of the OUN and UPA, see Per Anders Rudling, "The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust: A Study in the Manufacturing of Historical Myths," *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies*, Number 2107 (Pittsburgh: The Center for Russian and East European Studies, 2011): 2–4; and Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "The 'Ukrainian National Revolution' of Summer 1941," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* Vol. 12, No.1 (2011): 87–88. The most common explanation was that the radical and genocidal form of Ukrainian nationalism should be viewed as "integral nationalism." This assumption goes back to John Armstrong's monograph *Ukrainian Nationalism* from 1955, and Alexander Motyl's study *The Turn to the Right* from 1980. Neither of these scholars investigated and integrated into their studies the mass violence conducted by Ukrainian nationalists before, during, and after the Second World War, nor did they consider the similarities between the Ukrainian nationalists and movements such as the Ustaša, Iron Guard, and Hlinka Party. See John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955); Alexander Motyl, *The Turn to the Right: The Ideological Origins and Development of Ukrainian Nationalism, 1919–1929* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1980). In post-Soviet Ukraine, several articles and books about "integral nationalism" were published by Oleksandr Zaitsev. See Oleksandr Zaitsev, ed., *Natsionalizm i relihiia: Hreko-katolyts'ka tserkva ta ukraïns'kyi natsionalistychnyi rukh v Halychyni (1920–1930-ti roky)* (L'viv: Vydavnytstvo Ukraïns'koho Katolyts'koho Universytetu, 2011); Oleksandr Zaitsev, "Ukrainian Integral Nationalism in Quest of a 'Special Path' (1920s–1930s)," *Russian Politics and Law* Vol. 51, No. 5 (2013): 11–32; and Oleksandr Zaitsev, *Ukraïns'kyi integral'nyi natsionalizm (1920–1930-ti) roky: Narysy intelektual'noï istoriï* (Kiev: Krytyka, 2013).

2. For the concept of transnational fascism, see Arnd Bauerkämper, "Transnational Fascism: Cross-Border Relations between Regimes and Movements in Europe, 1922–1939," *East Central Europe* 37 (2010): 214–46. For

publications about fascism and Ukrainian nationalism, see Frank Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer 1914–1939* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2010), 571–92; John-Paul Himka, "The Importance of the Situational Element in East Central European Fascism," *East Central Europe* 37 (2010): 353–58; Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 83–114; Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist: Fascism, Genocide, and Cult* (Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2014); Anton Shekhovtsov, "By Cross and Sword: 'Clerical Fascism' in Interwar Western Ukraine," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* Vol. 8, No. 2 (2007): 271–85.

3. Leonid Fuks, *Entstehung der kommunistischen Faschismustheorie: Die Auseinandersetzung der Komintern mit Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus* 1921–1935 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1984), 109–11. In 1935, Georgi Dimitroff claimed in the Comintern report that fascist regimes were "the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital." Cf. Georgi Dimitroff, *The United Front Against War and Fascism: Report to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International 1935* (New York: Gama, 1974), 7.

4. Constantin Iordachi, "Comparative Fascist Studies. An Introduction," in *Comparative Fascist Studies. New Perspectives*, ed. Constantin Iordachi (London: Routledge 2009), 7–8; Daniel Ursprung, "Faschismus in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa: Theorien, Ansätze, Fragestellungen," in *Der Einfluss von Faschismus und Nationalsozialismus auf Minderheiten in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa*, ed. Mariana Hausleitner and Harald Roth (Munich: IKGS-Verlag, 2006), 12–13; Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism 1914-1945* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 128.

5. See for example Ernst Nolte, *Der Faschismus in seiner Epoche* (Munich: Piper, 1963); Eugen Weber, *Action Française: Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth Century France* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1962); and *Varieties of Fascism: Doctrines of Revolution in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1964). The first issue of *Journal of Comparative History* was devoted to fascism. Cf. *Journal of Comparative History* Vol. 1, No. 1 (1966); Stanley G. Payne, *Fascism: Comparison and*

Definition (Madison University of Wisconsin Press, 1980); *A History of Fascism 1914–1915* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995); Zeev Sternhell, "Fascist Ideology," in: *Fascism, A Reader's Guide*, *Analyses, Interpretations, Bibliography*; Walter Laqueur, ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 315–76; *Ni droite ni gauche: L'idéologie fasciste en France* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983); Renzo de Felice, *Le interpretazioni del fascismo* (Bari: Laterza, 1969).

6. For John Armstrong, see Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 87; Rudling, The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust, 2–3. For a debate about generic fascism between Roger Griffin and German historians, see Roger Griffin, Werner Loh and Andreas Umland, ed., *Fascism Past and Present, West and East: An International Debate on Concepts and Cases in the Comparative Study of the Extreme Right* (ibidem-Verlag: Stuttgart, 2006). Only recently German historians began to rethink the nature of European fascism, see Thomas Schlemmer and Hans Woller, ed., *Der Faschismus in Europa: Wege der Forschung* (Munich: De Gruyter 2014).

7. For an overview of and introduction to the writings of Roger Griffin, Robert Paxton, Roger Eatwell, and Emilio Gentile, see Constantin Iordachi, ed., *Comparative Fascist Studies: New Perspectives* (London: Routledge 2009).

8. Mark Antliff, *Avant-Garde Fascism: The Mobilization of Myth, Art and Culture in France, 1909–1939* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007); Julie Gottlieb, ed., *The Culture of Fascism: Visions of the Far Right in Britain* (London: Tauris, 2004), *Feminine Fascism: Women in Britain's Fascist Movement* (London: Tauris, 2002).

9. Sven Richard, *Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA* (Köln: Böhlau, 2002); Rory Yeomans, *Visions of Annihilation: The Ustasha Regime and the Cultural Politics of Fascism, 1941–1945* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012); Aristotle Kallis, *Genocide and Fascism: The Eliminationist Drive in Fascist Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

10. Arnd Bauerkämper, *Der Faschismus in Europa 1918–1945* (Stuttgart:

Reclam, 2006); "Transnational Fascism: Cross-Border Relations between Regimes and Movements in Europe, 1922–1939," *East Central Europe* 37 (2010): 214–46; Judith Keene, *Fighting for Franco: International Volunteers in Nationalist Spain during the Spanish Civil War* (London: Continuum, 2001); Federico Finchelstein, *Transatlantic Fascism: Ideology, Violence and the Sacred in Argentina and Italy, 1919–1945* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2010).

11. Tom Villis, *British Catholics and Fascism: Religious Identity and Political Extremism Between the Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Mary Vincent, *Catholicism in the Second Spanish Republic: Religion and Politics in Salamanca, 1930-36* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996); Richard Steigmann-Gall, *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

12. Marius Turda and Paul Weindling, ed., *Blood and Homeland: Eugenics and Racial Nationalism in Central and Southeast Europe, 1900–1940* (New York: Central European University Press, 2006); Roger Eatwell, "Fascism and Racism," in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*, ed. John Breuilly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 573–91; Anton Weiss-Wendt and Rory Yeomans, ed., *Racial Science in Hitler's New Europe, 1938-1945* (Lincoln, Neb: University of Nebraska Press, 2013); Gabriele Schneider, *Mussolini in Afrika: Die faschistische Rassenpolitik in den italienischen Kolonien, 1936-1941* (Köln: SH-Verlag, 2000).

13. Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism* (London: Printer, 1991), 26.

14. Ernst Nolte, *Die Krise des liberalen Systems und die faschistischen Bewegungen* (Munich: Piper, 1968), 385. See also Roger Eatwell, "The Nature of 'Generic Fascism': The 'Fascist Minimum' and the 'Fascist Matrix,'" in *Comparative Fascist Studies: New Perspectives*, ed. Constantin Iordachi (London: Routledge 2009), 137.

15. On the specifics of fascism in East Central Europe, see Constantin Iordachi, "Fascism in Interwar East Central and Southeastern Europe: Toward a New Transnational. Research Agenda," *East Central Europe* 37 (2010): 161–213;

Constantin Iordachi, "God's Chosen Warriors: Romantic Palingenesis, Militarism and Fascism in Modern Romania," *Comparative Fascist Studies: New Perspectives*, ed. Constantin Iordachi (London: Routledge 2009), 318–54.

16. For the history of Ukrainians, see Andreas Kappeler, *Kleine Geschichte der Ukraine* (München: Beck, 2009); Serhy Yekelchyk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

17. Iaroslav Hrytsak, *Narys istoriï Ukraïny: Formuvannia modernoï ukraïn's'koï natsiï XIX–XX stolittia* (Kiev: Heneza, 2000), 111–59; Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 414–21

18. Jarosław Hrycak, *Historia Ukrainy 1772–1999: Narodziny nowoczesnego narodu* (Lublin: Agencja "Wschód," 2000), 173, 188.

19. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 561.

20. Ibid., 547–49

21. Ibid., 547–57. For the League of Ukrainian Fascists, see Oleksandr Panchenko, *Mykola Lebed': Zhyttia, diial'nist', derzhavno-pravovi pohliady* (Kobeliaky: Kobeliaky, 2001), 15. For the greeting, see Sviatoslav Lypovets'kyi, *Orhanizatsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv (banderivtsi): Frahmenty diial'nosti ta borot'by* (Kiev: Ukraïns'ka Vydavnycha Spilka, 2010), 14.

22. For universities and schools, see Christoph Mick, *Kriegserfahrungen in einer multiethnischen Stadt: Lemberg 1914–1947* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 301–3; and Grzegorz Mazur, *Życie polityczne polskiego Lwowa 1918–1939* (Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2007), 140–41, 144–46, 149, 151. For discrimination, see Jerzy Tomaszewski, *Ojczyzna nie tylko Polaków: Mniejszości narodowe w Polsce w latach 1918–1939* (Warsaw: Młodzieżowa Agencja Wydawnicza, 1985), 62–63, 71–72. For general information on this subject, see Timothy Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations: Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 144–53.

23. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 598; Franziska Bruder, "*Den

ukrainischen Staat erkämpfen oder sterben!" Die Organisation Ukrainischer Nationalisten (OUN) 1929–1948 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2007).

24. Rossoliński-Liebe, *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist*, 66-67.

25. Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 90–113.

26. Christoph Dieckmann, "Lithuania in Summer 1941: The German Invasion and the Kaunas Pogrom," in *Shared History—Divided Memory: Jews and Others in Soviet-Occupied Poland, 1939–1941*, ed. Elazar Barkan, Elizabeth A. Cole, and Kai Struve (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitatsverlag, 2007), 370–85; Siegfried Gasparaitis, "'Verrätern wird nur dann vergeben, wenn sie wirklich beweisen können, daß sie mindestans einen Juden liquidiert haben.' Die 'Front Litauischer Aktivisten' (LAF) und die antisowjetischen Aufstände 1941," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* Vol. 49 (2001): 889–90, 897–904.

27. For the text of the Croatian state proclamation act, see Slavko Vukčević, *Zločini na jugoslovenskim prostorima u prvom i drugom svetskom ratu: Zločini Nezavisne Države Hrvatske, 1941–45*, Vol 1. (Belgrade: Vojnoistorijski institut, 1993), document 3 (the declaration). For the Ukrainian text, see "Akt proholoshennia ukraïns'koï derzhavy, 30.06.1941," TsDAVOV f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 5, 3.

28. Letter to the Führer [sic] of the Fascist Italy Benito Mussolini in Rome, 3 July 1941; Letter to General Francisco Franco, 3 July 1941; Letter to the Poglavnik of the Independent Croatian State Dr. Ante Pavelić, 3 July 1941; Letter to the Führer und Reichskanzler des Grossdeutschen Reiches Adolf Hitler, TsDAVOV f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 22, 1–4, 8–9.

29. For the Lviv pogrom, see John-Paul Himka, "The Lviv Pogrom of 1941: The Germans, Ukrainian Nationalists, and the Carnival Crowd," *Canadian Slavonic Papers* Vol. LIII, Nos. 2-4 (2011): 209–43; Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "Der Verlauf und die Täter des Lemberger Pogroms vom Sommer 1941. Zum aktuellen Stand der Forschung," *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* 22 (2013): 207–43; Christoph Mick, "Incompatible Experiences: Poles, Ukrainians and Jews in Lviv

under Soviet and German Occupation, 1939–44," *Journal of Contemporary History* Vol. 46, No. 2 (2011): 336–63; and Hannes Heer, "Einübung in den Holocaust: Lemberg Juni/Juli 1941," *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 49 (2001): 409–27. For meeting Škirpa and other politicians in Berlin, see Iaroslav Stets'ko, *30 chervnia 1941: Proholoshennia vidnovlennia derzhavnosty Ukraïny* (Toronto: Liga Vyzvolennia Ukraïny, 1967), 272–73, 276.

30. For Ehernhäftlinge and Sonderhäftlinge, see Volker Koop, *In Hitlers Hand: Sonder- und Ehrenhäftlinge der SS* (Böhlau-Verlag: Köln, 2010), 7–12.

31. Adam Cyra, "Banderowcy w KL Auschwitz," *Studia nad faszyzmem i zbrodniami hitlerowskimi* 30 (2008): 388–402; Bruder, "*Den Ukrainischen Staat*, 137.

32. Armin Heinen, *Die Legion "Erzengel Michael" in Rumänien Soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986), 428–33, 447–53, 460–63, 518–21; Koop, *In Hitlers Hand*, 190–96.

33. For Kubiivych, UTsK, and related questions, see Frank Golczewski, "Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine" in *Kooperation und Verbrechen: Formen der "Kollaboration" im östlichen Europa 1939–1945*, ed. Christoph Dieckmann, Babette Quinkert, and Tatjana Tönsmeyer (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003), 160; and John-Paul Himka, "Krakivski visti and the Jews, 1943: A Contribution to the History of Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Second World War," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* Vol. 21, Nos. 1–2 (1996): 81–95. For aryanization, see for example "Betr. Judenangelegenheiten," DALO, f. R-1928, op. 1, spr. 4, USHMM RG 1995.A.1086, reel 31. For Waffen-SS Galizien, see Michael James Melnyk, *To Battle: The Formation and History of the 14th Galician Waffen-SS Division* (Solihull: Helion, 2002); Golczewski, Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine, 178–79; Frank Golczewski, "Shades of Grey: Reflections on Jewish-Ukrainian and German-Ukrainian Relations in Galicia," in *The Shoah in Ukraine: History, Testimony, Memorialization*, ed. Ray Brandon and Wendy Lower (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 136; and John-Paul Himka, "A Central European Diaspora under the Shadow of World War II: The Galician Ukrainians in North America," *Austrian History Yearbook* 37 (2006): 24. For the oath to

Hitler, see "An den Reichsführer, 05.2.1945," BAB Berlin NS 19/544, 87–89.

34. For mass violence, see the section "Becoming Genocidal."

35. Frank Golczewski, "Die Ukraine im Zweiten Weltkrieg," in *Geschichte der Ukraine*, ed. Frank Golczewski (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Götingen, 1993), 259–60; Bruder, "*Den Ukrainischen Staat,* 228–29. For Bandera escaping to Vienna, see "Protokol doprosa parashiutysta po klichke 'Miron', 16.07.1951," HDA SBU f. 6, op. 37, spr. 56232, 27–72, in *Stepan Bandera*, ed. Serhiichuk, 3:77–79; and "Protokol doprosa obviniaemogo Okhrimovicha Vasiliia Ostapovicha, 21.10.1952," HDA SBU f. 5, spr. 445, Vol. 1, 216–25, in Volodymyr Serhiichuk, ed., *Stepan Bandera u dokumentakh radians'kykh orhaniv derzhavnoï bezpeky (1939–1959)* (Kiev: Vipol 2009), 3:270–71.

36. For Dontsov's biography, see Mykhailo Sosnovs'kyi, *Dmytro Dontsov: Politychnyi portret* (New York: Trident International, 1974). For his ideology, see Tomasz Stryjek, *Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego: Analizy wybranych koncepcji* (Wrocław: FUNNA, 2000), 110–90.

37. "Chy my fashysty?," *Zahrava* 1, 7 (1923), 97–102.

38. Ibid., 98.

39. Ibid., 100–101.

40. "Oleksandr Zaitsev, "Ukraïns'kyi natsionalizm ta italiis'kyi fashyzm (1922–1939)," *Ukraïna moderna: Mizhnarodnyi intelektual'nyi chasopys*, 3 December 2012, http://www.uamoderna.com/md/98-zaitsev (accessed 19 November 2013).

41. Dmytro Dontsov, "Pro baroniv seredniovichchia i baraniv z baiky," *Vistnyk* 1 (1936): 53.

42. Dmytro Dontsov, "Sumerk marksyzmu," *Vistnyk* 4 (1933): 304.

43. Devius [D. Dontsov], "Komintern na novykh reikakh," *Vistnyk* 9 (1935): 657.

44. Sosnovs'kyi, *Dmytro Dontsov*, 167–68, 236–39, 375–80.

45. Letter of the Society of Fascist Studies (Tovarystvo fashyzmoznavstva) to Dmytro Dontsov, December 1935, Archiwum Dmitra Doncowa, BN, Mf 82672, 412.

46. Mykhailo Ostroverkha, *Mussolini. Liudyna i chyn* (Lviv: Knyhozbirnia Vistnyka, 1934); Rostyslav Iendyk, *Adolf Hitler* (Lviv: Knyhozbirnia Vistnyka, 1934). In 1937 the library of Vistnyk published the biography of Francisco Franco. Cf. R. Kerch, *Franko – vozhd' espantsiv* (Lviv: Knyhozbirnia Vistnyka, 1934). See also Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 582–84; Taras Kurylo and John-Paul Himka, "Iak OUN stavylasia do ievreïv? Rozdumy nad knyzhkoiu Volodymyra V"iatrovycha," *Ukraïna Moderna* Vol. 13, No. 2 (2008): 264; and Tomasz Stryjek, *Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego: Analizy wybranych koncepcji* (Wrocław: FUNNA, 2000), 118–19, 132, 139–40, 143–51. For *La Dottrina Del Fascismo*, see Shekhovtsov, By Cross and Sword, 274.

47. Dmytro Dontsov, *Natsionalizm* (Lviv: Nove Zhyttia, 1926), 194–200.

48. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 561.

49. O. Mytsiuk, "Fashyzm (Dyskusiina stattia)," *Rozbudova Natsiï* 8–9 (1929): 262–70; O. Mytsiuk, "Fashyzm (Dyskusiina stattia)," *Rozbudova Natsiï* 10–11 (1929): 328–37.

50. Ievhen Onats'kyi, "Lysty z Italiï I. Deshcho pro fashyzm," *Rozbudova natsiï* 3 (1928): 95.

51. Ievhen Onats'kyi, "Fashyzm i my (Z pryvodu statti prof. Mytsiuka)," *Rozbudova natsiï* 12 (1929): 397. Emphasis in the original.

52. Ibid., 397.

53. Ievhen Onats'kyi, "Lysty z Italiï I. Deshcho pro fashyzm," *Rozbudova natsiï* 1 (1928): 96.

54. Ievhen Onats'kyi, "Fashyzm i my (Z pryvodu statti prof. Mytsiuka)," *Rozbudova natsiï* 12 (1929): 399.

55. Ibid., 399.

56. Ibid., 399–400.

57. Ibid., 401.

58. Ibid., 401.

59. Ievhen Onats'kyi, *U vichnomu misti: Zapysky ukraïns'koho zhurnalista rik 1930* (Buenos Aires: Vydavnytstvo Mykoly Denysiuka, 1954), 43–44.

60. Mykola Stsibors'kyi, *Natsiokratiia* (Paris, 1935); "Narys proiektu osnovnykh zakoniv konstytutsiï Ukraïns'koï derzhavy," TsDAVOV, f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 7, 1–9.

61. Mykola Stsibors'kyi, *Natsiokratiia* (Paris, 1935), 49, 72.

62. Ibid., 50.

63. Ibid., 58.

64. Ibid., 59–60.

65. Ibid., 81–82. Emphasis in the original.

66. Ibid., 82.

67. Ibid., 50. Emphasis in the original.

68. Ibid., 54. Emphasis in the original.

69. Ibid., 57–58. Emphasis in the original.

70. Ibid., 72.

71. Ibid., 73–74. Emphasis in the original.

72. Ibid., 56.

73. Ibid., 108. Emphasis in the original.

74. Ibid., 78. Emphasis in the original.

75. Ibid., 78. Emphasis in the original.

76. Ibid., 79.

77. Ibid., 76.

78. Ibid., 77–78. Emphasis in the original.

79. Ibid., 80–81.

80. Ibid., 84. Emphasis in the original.

81. Ibid., 84. The term "political chieftains" or "political *otamans*" was used as a derogatory term for leaders of "counterrevolutionary" units during the Civil War in Ukraine, in 1917–1921.

82. Ibid., 97.

83. Ibid., 84. Emphasis in the original.

84. Ibid., 80, 105–106. Emphasis in the original.

85. Ibid., 109. Emphasis in the original.

86. Ibid., 115–116.

87. Ibid., 114, 116.

88. "Narys proiektu osnovnykh zakoniv konstytutsiï Ukraïns'koï derzhavy," TsDAVOV, f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 7, 2.

89. For Ukrainian youth's attitude to Konovalets', see "Komunikat Nr. 7," AAN, MSZ, syg. 5316, 76. For the meeting with Hitler, see Karol Grünberg and Bolesław Sprengel, *Trudne sąsiedztwo: Stosunki polsko-ukraińskie w X-XX wieku* (Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 2005) 392–93. Grünber and Sprengel provide as the source "Sprawy Narodowościowe," no. 2–3 (1933): 217–18. For other aspects, see Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 35, 37, 63, 270–78, 282, 339, 342, 351, 374, 386–89, 391–95, 397, 430, 432–49, 555, 561, 566–72, 580, 798–807. For the commemorations, see *Ievhen Konovalets'* (Paris 1938), 64–96.

90. Andrij Mel'nyk, "An Seine Excellenz Reichsaussenminister von Ribbentrop," 2 May 1939, R104430/1–2, Political Archives of the Foreign Office in Berlin (*Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes*, PAAA).

91. For KAUM, see Shekhovtsov, By Cross and Sword, 279. For the letter, see Andrij Melnyk, "An Seine Excellenz Reichsaussenminister von Ribbentrop," 2 May 1939, R 104430/1–2, PAAA. For all other aspects, see Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 272, 274–77, 351, 392, 802–804, 943–44.

92. For Bandera's life and cult of personality, see Rossoliński-Liebe, *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist.*

93. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 456, 504, 544, 555, 560, 564, 566–68, 697–99; Paul Stepan Pirie, *Unraveling the Banner: A Biographical Study of Stepan Bandera*. MA thesis: University of Alberta, 1993; Karl Anders, *Mord auf Befehl*: *Der Fall Stachynskij* (Tübingen: Fritz Schlichtenmayer, 1963); Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "Celebrating Fascism and War Criminality in Edmonton: The Political Myth and Cult of Stepan Bandera in Multicultural Canada," *Kakanien Revisited*, 12 (2010): 1–16.

94. Serhii Plokhy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevskyi and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005),

92–95.

95.   Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* (Kiev: Persha spilka, 1913), 1:307, 310. For an English translation, see Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *History of Ukraine—Rus': From prehistory to the eleventh century*, ed. Andrzej Poppe and Frank Sysyn, trans. Marta Skorupsky (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1997), 1:234, 236.

96.   Roman Koval, "Heroi, shcho ne zmih vriatuvaty Bat'kivshchyny," in *Samostiina Ukraïna*, ed. Roman Koval (Kiev: Diokor, 2003), 9.

97.   Ibid., 9.

98.   Petro Mirchuk, *Stepan Bandera: Symvol revoliutsiinoï bezkompromisovosty* (New York: Orhanizatsiia oborony chotyr'okh svobid Ukraïny, 1961), 14, 18; Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 598

99.   Oleh Shablii, "Peredmova," in Stepan Rudnyts'kyi, *Chomu my khochemo samostiinoï Ukraïny*, ed. L. M. Harbachuk (Lviv: Svit, 1994), 8.

100.   Stepan Rudnyts'kyi, "Do osnov ukraïns'koho natsionalizmu," in *Chomu my khochemo samostiinoï Ukraïny*, edited by L. M. Harbarchuk (Lviv: Vydavnytsvo Svit, 1994), 297.

101.   Ibid., 297.

102.   Ibid., 298–99.

103.   Stepan Rudnyts'kyi, "Chomu my khochemo samostiinoï Ukraïny," in *Chomu my khochemo samostiinoï Ukraïny*, ed. L. M. Harbarchuk (Lviv: Vydavnytsvo Svit, 1994), 38–39.

104.   Ibid., 39.

105.   Ibid., 39–40.

106. Ibid., 40.

107. Rudnyts'kyi, Do osnov ukraïns'koho natsionalizmu, 307.

108. Ibid., 308.

109. Mykola Sukhovers'kyi, *Moï spohady* (Kiev: Smoloskyp, 1997), 50.

110. "Postanovy II. Velykoho Zboru," TsDAHO f. 1, op. 23, spr. 926, 188.

111. "Orhanizatsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv: Natsiia iak spetsies. Rodyna v systemi orhanizovanoho ukraïns'koho natsionalizmu," HDA SBU, f, 13, spr. 376, Vol. 6, 6v. The author of the brochure was referring to Stepan Rudnyts'kyi, *Do osnov ukraïns'koho natsionalizmu* (Vienna, 1923).

112. Grzegorz Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka 1942–1960: Działalność Organizacji Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów i Ukraińskiej Powstańczej Armii* (Warsaw: Rytm, 2006), 346–47.

113. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 599.

114. Cf. for example Iur. Mylianych, "Zhydy, sionizm i Ukraïna," *Rozbudova Natsiï* 8–9 (1929): 271.

115. Antony Polonsky, *The Jews in Poland and Russia, 1914–2008* (Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2010), 3:32–43.

116. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 497–505.

117. Dmytro Dontsov, "Symon Petliura," in *Literaturno Naukoyi Vistnyk* 5, 7/8 (1926), 326–28, quoted in Marco Carynnyk, "Foes of Our Rebirth: Ukrainian Nationalist Discussions about Jews, 1929–1947," *Nationalities Papers* Vol. 39, No. 3 (2011): 319.

118. Mykola Stsibors'kyi, "Ukraïns'kyi natsionalizm i zhydivstvo," *Rozbudova Natsiï* 11–12 (November-December 1930): 272, quoted in Carynnyk, Foes of Our

Rebirth, 320.

119. Cf. Carynnyk, 325–26.

120. Mykola Stsibors'kyi, "Probliemy hospodars'koï vlasnosty," *Na sluzhbi natsiï: Al'manakh* (1938): 14, quoted in Carynnyk, Foes of Our Rebirth, 326.

121. Mykola Stsibors'kyi, *Zemel'ne pytannia* (Paris: Ukraïns'ka Knyharnia-Nakladnia, 1939), 85, quoted in Carynnyk, "Foes of Our Rebirth," 326.

122. "Narys proiektu osnovnykh zakoniv konstytutsiï Ukraïns'koï derzhavy," TsDAVOV, f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 7, 8. For the circumstances of writing this draft , see Carynnyk, Foes of Our Rebirth, 324.

123. Iur. Mylianych, "Zhydy, sionizm i Ukraïna," *Rozbudova Natsiï* 8–9 (1929): 271.

124. Volodymyr Martynets', *Zhydivs'ka probliema v Ukraïni* (London, 1938).

125. Ibid., 1–3.

126. Ibid., 8–16.

127. "Komunikat Nr. 7," AAN, MSZ syg. 5316, 63–71, 77; Petro Mirchuk, *Narys istoriï OUN: 1920–1939* (Kiev: Ukraïns'ka Vydavnycha Spilka, 2007), 251; Petro Arsenych and Taras Fedoriv, *Rodyna Banderiv: Do 90-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia ta 40-richchia trahichnoï smerti providnyka OUN Stepana Bandery (1909–1959)* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: Nova Zoria, 1998), 7–8.

128. Mazur, *Życie polityczne*, 139.

129. Ostap Hrytsai, "Dva khloptsi hynut' za Ukraïnu," *Rozbudova natsiï* 1–2 (1933): 1–3; "Iz Ukraïns'koï Golgoty," *Surma* Vol. 67, No. 5 (1933): 1; Roman Wysocki, *Organizacja Ukraińskich Nacjonalistów: Geneza, struktura, program, ideologia* (Lublin: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Marie Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2003),

289.

130. Lypovets'kyi, *Orhanizatsiia Ukraïns'kykh Natsionalistiv*, 14.

131. Rossoliński-Liebe, *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist*, 139–40, 151–52, 156, 160–61.

132. Letter from Bandera to Mel'nyk, TsDAVOV f. 3833, op. 1, spr. 71, 9.

133. "Postanovy II. Velykoho Zboru," TsDAHO f. 1, op. 23, spr. 926, 199.

134. Also non-fascist, moderately nationalist movements and peasant parties across Europe heavily relied on folk costumes in their propaganda. On this question see for example Laura Olsen, *Performing Russia: Folk Revival and Russian Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2004); Violeta Davoliute, *The Making and Breaking of Soviet Lithuania: Memory and Modernity in the Wake of War* (New York: Routledge 2013).

135. For collections of pictures from these celebrations, see Melnyk, *To Battle*; Bohdan Matsiv (ed.), *Ukraïns'ka dyviziia 'Halychyna': Istoriia u svitlynakh vid zasnuvannia u 1943 r. do zvil'nennia z polonu 1949 r.* (L'viv: ZUKTs 2009); Nusya Roth collection RG 1871, YIVO, Institute for Jewish Research, New York; Per Anders Rudling, 'They Defended Ukraine': The 14. Waffen-Grenadier-Division der SS (Galizische Nr. 1) Revisited, *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* Vol. 25, No. 3 (2012): 329–68; and "'The Honor They So Clearly Deserve': Legitimizing the Waffen-SS Galizien," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* Vol. 26, No. 1 (2013): 114–37.

136. Kurt Lewin, *Przeżyłem: Saga Świętego Jura w roku 1946* (Warsaw: Zeszyty Literackie, 2006), 58–59; Jacob Gerstenfeld-Maltiel, *My Private War: One Man's Struggle to Survive the Soviets and the Nazis* (London: Mitchell, 1993), 60.

137. "Kriegs-Erinnerungen des General der Infanterie Karl von Roques aus der ersten Zeit des Ostfeldzuges 1941, I. Teil," BA-MA Freiburg, N 152/10, 4–5.

138. See the illustration on the cover and the collection "Stanisławów. Wizyta

gubernatora Hansa Franka," syg. 2-3020 to 2-3028, in Narodowe Archiwum Cyfrowe, http://www.audiovis.nac.gov.pl/

139. Shekhovtsov, By Cross and Sword, 275

140. Stepan Bandera, "Proty fal'shuvannia vyzvol'nykh pozytsii," in *Perspektyvy ukraïns'koï revoliutsiï*, ed. Vasyl' Ivanyshyn (Drohobych: Vidrodzhennia, 1999), 323–24.

141. Emilio Gentile, *Politics as Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Emilio Gentile, "The Sacralisation of Politics: Definitions, Interpretations and Reflections on the Question of Secular Religion and Totalitarianism," *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* Vol.1, No.1 (2000), 18–55; Emilio Gentile, "Fascism as Political Religion," *Journal of Contemporary History* Vol. 25, Nos. 2–3 (1990): 229–51.

142. Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 598.

143. Mykola Konrad, *Natsionalizm i katolytsyzm* (Lviv: Meta, 1934).

144. Ibid., 5–6. Emphasis in the original.

145. Ibid., 6.

146. Ibid., 7.

147. Ibid., 7–8, 10.

148. Ibid., 12.

149. Ibid., 12.

150. Ibid., 13. Emphasis in the original.

151. Ibid., 14–6.

152. Ibid., 17–8. Emphasis in the original.

153. Ibid., 26.

154. Ibid., 25.

155. Ibid., 26.

156. Ibid., 27.

157. Ibid., 18, 23.

158. Ibid., 41.

159. Ibid., 43. Emphasis in the original.

160. Ibid., 28.

161. Ibid., 29.

162. Ibid., 29. Emphasis in the original.

163. Ibid., 33.

164. Ibid., 45. For an alternative translation, see Shekhovtsov, By Cross and Sword, 281.

165. "Permanentna revolutsiia," *Surma* Vol. 37, No. 10 (1930): 4.

166. Ibid., 4. Emphasis in the original.

167. Ibid., 5. Emphasis in the original.

168. Ibid., 6.

169. Ibid., 7.

170. Ibid., 7.

171. For the plans to begin a revolution in 1933 or 1934, see Władysław Żeleński, *Akt oskarżenia przeciwko Stefanowi Banderze, Mikołajowi Łebedowi, Darji Hnatkiwskiej, Jarosławowi Karpyncowi, Mikołajowi Klymyszynowi, Bohdanowi Pidhajnemu, Iwanowi Malucy, Jakobowi Czornijowi, Eugenjuszowi Kaczmarskiemu, Romanowi Myhalowi, Katerzynie Zaryckiej, oraz Jarosławowi Rakowi,* Warsaw, 2 October 1935 (published as a booklet), 32, 80; and Mirchuk, *Narys istoriï OUN*, 252. For the plans and attempts to begin a revolution in 1939, see Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka*, 68–69. For the "Ukrainian National Revolution" in 1941, see Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 83–114.

172. For the concept and etymology of "genocide," see Adam Jones, *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2011); A. Dirk Moses, "Genocide," *Australian Humanities Review* 55 (2013): 23–44; Christian Gerlach, *Extremely Violent Societies: Mass Violence in the Twentieth-Century World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 2–3, 5–6.

173. For some abuses of the concept of genocide in the context of the OUN and UPA, see Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "Debating, Obfuscating and Disciplining the Holocaust: Post-Soviet Historical Discourses on the OUN-UPA and other Nationalist Movements," *East European Jewish Affairs* Vol. 42, No. 3 (2012): 220–21.

174. Żeleński, *Akt oskarzenia*, 54–56; Timothy Snyder, *Sketches from a Secret War. A Polish Artist's Mission to Liberate Soviet Ukraine* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 157; Golczewski, *Deutsche und Ukrainer*, 441, 444–45. For the assassination of Polish and Ukrainian politicians and political activists, see "Ukraińska Organizacja Wojskowa. Warszawa 30.11.1934," AAN, MSZ, syg. 9377, 30–31.

175. Voienna doktryna ukraïns'kykh natsionalistiv, OUN Archives in Kiev, f. 1, op. 2. Spr. 466, 1, quoted in "Defiliada v Moskvi ta Varshavi: 'Voienna doktryna

ukraïns'kykh nationalistiv' Mykhaila Kolodzins'koho," *Ukraïna moderna*, 6 October 2012, http://www.uamoderna.com/event/186 (accessed 22 September 2014).

176. Zaitsev, *Ukraïns'kyi integral'nyi Natsionalizm*, 271.

177. Voienna doktryna ukraïns'kykh natsionalistiv, OUN Archives in Kiev, f. 1, op. 2. Spr. 466, 103–4, quoted in "Defiliada v Moskvi ta Varshavi: 'Voienna doktryna ukraïns'kykh nationalistiv' Mykhailo Kolodzins'koho," *Ukraïna moderna*, 6 October 2012, http://www.uamoderna.com/event/186 (accessed 22 September 2014)

178. Ibid. 136–37.

179. Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 84, 90–91; "Defiliada v Moskvi ta Varshavi: 'Voienna doktryna ukraïns'kykh nationalistiv' Mykhailo Kolodzins'koho," *Ukraïna moderna*, 6 October 2012, http://www. uamoderna.com/event/186 (accessed 22 September 2014).

180. For the killings of Poles, see Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka*, 70, 72; Władysław Siemaszko and Ewa Siemaszko, *Ludobójstwo dokonane przez nacjonalistów ukraińskich na ludności polskiej Wołynia 1939–1945* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo von borowiecky, 2000), 2:1034–37.

181. Rossoliński-Liebe, Der Verlauf und die Täter des Lemberger Pogroms, 213–16; Rossoliński-Liebe, The 'Ukrainian National Revolution,' 90–95.

182. Alexander Kruglov, "Jewish Losses in Ukraine, 1941–1944," in *The Shoah in Ukraine: History, Testimony, Memorialization*, ed. Ray Brandon and Wendy Lower (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 274; Himka, The Lviv Pogrom of 1941, 209–43; Mick, Incompatible Experiences, 336–63; Rossoliński-Liebe, Der Verlauf und die Täter des Lemberger Pogroms, 216 –41; Wendy Lower, "Pogroms, Mob Violence and Genocide in Western Ukraine, Summer 1941: Varied Histories, Explanations and Comparisons," *Journal of Genocide Research* Vol. 13, No. 3 (2011): 114–55; Timothy Snyder, "The Life and Death of Western Volhynian Jewry, 1921–1945," in *The Shoah in Ukraine: History,*

Testimony, Memorialization, ed. Ray Brandon and Wendy Lower (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), 89–94; Kai Struve, "Rites of Violence? The Pogroms of Summer 1941," *Polin. Studies in Polish Jewry* 24 (2012): 257–74.

183. Bohdan Kazanivs'kyi, *Shliakhom Legendy: Spomyny* (London: Ukraïns'ka Vydavnycha Spilka, 1975), 263–66; Gabriel N. Finder and Alexander V. Prusin, "Collaboration in Eastern Galicia: The Ukrainian Police and the Holocaust," *East European Jewish Affairs* Vol. 34, No. 2 (2004): 104–105; Golczewski, Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine, 172; Lucyna Kulińska and Adam Roliński, *Kwestia ukraińska i eksterminacja ludności polskiej w Małopolsce Wschodniej w świetle dokumentów Polskiego Państwa Podziemnego 1943–1944* (Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2004), 210.

184. Snyder, The Life and Death of Western Volhynian Jewry, 89–97; Omer Bartov, "Wartime Lies and Other Testimonies: Jewish-Christian Relations in Buczacz, 1939–1944," *East European Politics and Societies* Vol. 26, No. 3 (2011): 491–506; Rossoliński-Liebe, *Stepan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist*, 256–60; Dieter Pohl, *Nationalsozialistische Judenverfolgung in Ostgalizien 1941–1944*: *Organisation und Durchführung eines staatlichen Massenverbrechens* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1997), 139–331; Golczewski, Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine, 171–75; Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "Erinnerungslücke Holocaust: Die ukrainische Diaspora und der Genozid an den Juden," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* Vol. 62, No. 3 (2014): 403–4.

185. Grzegorz Motyka, "Polski policjant na Wołyniu," *Karta* 24 (1998): 126; Timothy Snyder, "The Causes of Ukrainian-Polish Ethnic Cleansing 1943," *Past and Present* 179 (2003): 211–12.

186. Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka*, 410–12.

187. Bruder, "*Den ukrainischen Staat erkämpfen*, 217–23; Philip Friedman, "Ukrainian-Jewish Relations during the Nazi Occupation," in *Roads to Extinction*, ed. Philip Friedman, Ada June Friedman, Salo Baron (New York: Jewish Publication Society, 1980), 187–89; Shmuel Spector, *The Holocaust of Volhynian Jews 1941–1944* (Jerusalem: Achva Press, 1990), 256; John-Paul Himka, *The Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Holocaust*. Paper prepared for the

forty-first national convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Boston, 12–15 November 2009.

188. Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka*, 303–10. For the discussion of this question by Polish and Ukrainian historians, see Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, "Der polnisch–ukrainische Historikerdiskurs über den polnisch-ukrainischen Konflikt 1943–1947," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* Vol. 57, No. 1 (2009): 54–85.

189. For the numbers, see Motyka, *Ukraińska partyzantka*, 649–50; Katrin Boeckh, *Stalinismus in der Ukraine: Die Rekonstruktion des sowjetischen Systems nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 366–67. On the conflict see also Alexander Statiev, *The Soviet Counterinsurgency in Western Borderlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Jeffrey Burds, "AGENTURA: Soviet Informants' Networks and the Ukrainian Underground in Galicia, 1944–1948," *East European Politics and Societies* Vol. 11, No. 1 (1996): 89–130; Jeffrey Burds, "The Early Cold War in Soviet West Ukraine, 1944–1948," *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian & East European Studies*, Number 1505. Pittsburgh: The Center for Russian and East European Studies, 2001.

190. James Mace Ward, *Priest, Politician, Collaborator: Jozef Tiso and the Making of Fascist Slovakia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), 199.